

THE  
SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 906, Vol. 35.

March 8, 1873.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

THERE can be no doubt that the Ministers have been placed in a position of great and unexpected danger and difficulty. Their University Bill, which was at first welcomed with singular unanimity, has excited the most violent opposition. Up to the present moment not a single Liberal member of any weight, representing an English or Scotch constituency, has spoken in favour of it. The few Irish members who have supported it have done so in the most lukewarm manner. The Irish Roman Catholic Bishops have absolutely refused to have anything to do with the scheme of education which it creates. The existing academical bodies of Ireland, including not only the Queen's Colleges and Trinity, but the Catholic University, have unhesitatingly denounced it. Apart from the question of the fate of the Ministry, which is perhaps linked with it, the whole number of members who would willingly vote for it would probably not reach a hundred. No English or Scotch constituency, and, so far as we are aware, no Irish constituency, has made any sign of being ready to support it. This is certainly one of the most singular occurrences in the modern political history of England. A strong Cabinet, a Cabinet with a long experience of the House it has to deal with, a Cabinet that has won two great triumphs by the mode in which it has handled Irish questions, produces a Bill, the sketch of which, when given by the PREMIER, delights every one; and three weeks afterwards it is discovered that the fifteen persons who invented it are almost the only fifteen persons in the kingdom who are prepared to give this invention any effective support. We are not saying that this ought to be so. The Catholics might have been expected, if they understood accurately the interests of the Denominationalism which is dear to them, to have seen in the Bill the elements of the best bargain they are ever likely to get from Parliament. But we are speaking only of facts, and the simple fact is that the Bill has next to no supporters. The Opposition leaders have seen their opportunity, and have used it with a boldness which, as a piece of political cleverness, does them credit. No such language as that used by Mr. GATHORNE HARDY has been heard at Westminster on the Conservative side since the election of 1868. He avowed not only his intention to vote against the second reading, but his willingness to accept the consequences. He challenged Mr. GLADSTONE to take the sense of the constituencies on the subject. The Ballot Bill has now, according to the Ministerial theory, enabled the constituencies to speak their mind freely and fairly. Well then, said Mr. HARDY, let them say freely and fairly whether they like this University Bill. Mr. HARDY, we think, judged quite rightly. It would be the greatest possible advantage to the Conservative party, and the greatest possible disadvantage to the Liberal party, that the prominent issue for the next election should be the acceptance or rejection of this University Bill; for Liberal members, in order to hold their seats, would have to proclaim that they entirely disagreed with their leaders, and there is no enthusiasm or energy in a party thus divided within itself. The Ministry, on the other hand, not wishing to break up their party in this way, might resign instead of dissolving. Either they would have to come back again discredited by failure, and with their hold over their followers sensibly weakened, or a Conservative Government would come into power holding a much stronger position than it could have hoped to hold for a long time. Either it would go on through the Session and pass an Irish University Bill, such as the great majority of the House has shown its willingness to accept, and then it would go to the country with the credit of success, or it would dissolve at once; and then, in addition to the advantage

of being able to make the acceptance or rejection of the Irish University Bill the issue between parties, it would have the advantage of being the Government in office at the time of the elections. And this advantage is considerable even now that the Government can no longer directly affect constituencies; for the actual Government can always appeal to have a fair trial given it; and the numerous persons who look on an election simply as a means of promoting some pet project of their own look to those in office rather than to those out of office as the most valuable instruments for their purpose.

The natural reflection on all this is, that as neither the Liberal constituencies nor the bulk of the Liberal party have any wish to quarrel with the Ministry, but, on the contrary, in spite of occasional quarrels, look up to them with gratitude and respect, and as the House of Commons is quite ready to pass an Irish University Bill, if it can but get permission to pass the sort of Bill it would like, far the best thing would be that the Government should stay in office, and mould their Bill so as to suit the wishes of a Parliamentary majority. This would be far the best thing, not only for the Ministry, or for the Liberal party, but also for the country. For an election turning on questions of religious difference would be a deplorable calamity, and the Irish University question is really one that wants settling, and the sooner it is settled in a tolerably satisfactory manner the better for Ireland and for England. There is really nothing whatever in what the Ministers have done that calls for any severe censure. They have made a mistake arising from want of political forethought in a matter where every set of statesmen in their turn have made crowds of such mistakes; but that is all. Every one acknowledges that they prepared their scheme with the utmost singleness and honesty of purpose, holding the balance, as they thought, evenly between contending parties, and wishing to give every one concerned a fair chance. They were quite right, as Mr. HORSMAN and even Mr. HARDY admitted, in resisting Mr. BOURKE's amendment, for they were asked by it to do that which it was impossible for them to do. They were also clearly right in not adopting the course pressed on them by Mr. HORSMAN, and withdrawing the Bill directly they found that the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops had tabooed it. To have done so would have been equivalent to an ignominious avowal that an English Ministry was prepared to bring in and abandon Bills at the dictation of a clerical clique. They had no course to take consistent with proper self-respect except that of going on as well as they could, saying all that they could manage to say in defence of their scheme, and then submitting the second reading to the decision of the House. They have a strong case to appeal to their supporters for so much help as will carry the second reading. They may fairly ask their party not to vote lightly out of existence a Cabinet which has so often led the party to victory, and a PREMIER whose name alone has won so many of their seats. The GLADSTONE Government does not deserve to fall for the mere mistake of thinking that it had hit upon a mode of conciliating sectarian adversaries. Individual members, too, may be allowed to look at their own interests. It will be very disadvantageous to them, and unfairly disadvantageous to them, that their seats should be endangered, and their Conservative rivals in counties and boroughs strengthened, because the Government has honestly made a slight mistake in calculating on the probable feeling of Irish religious factions. The Government, on the other hand, must do something for their supporters. They must not ride a very high horse, and resent obtaining a majority pitiful as compared with the majorities which sanctioned the Irish measures of their two first Sessions. They must be content to stay in office, and do the best they

can with the Bill, if they can only get a respectable majority; and that they may get such a majority is to be hoped for in the interests both of England and Ireland.

The Government has no chance, and knows that it has no chance, of carrying the second reading, unless it proclaims its willingness to admit of many changes in the Bill; and if it stays in office, and tries to pass the Bill, the changes which it will have to tolerate will be very considerable indeed. But the Government has already gone a long way in the path of concession; it has gone so far, indeed, that it is not without some surprise that we observe how far it has gone. In order to understand this, it is necessary to remember what the basis of the Bill was. The Government had, as it thought, got a great and beautiful secret. It had hit on a new, peculiar, and effectual plan of overcoming the difficulties which had baffled all other persons who had attempted to deal with Irish University Education. The secret which was kept so religiously that the Ministry deprived itself of all opportunity of judging from previous criticism how far it had the promise of success, was this:—The problem was how to satisfy the claims of the Catholic Bishops, and yet to keep within the lines in which Parliament is bent on moving. What the Catholic Bishops want is the complete control of education, and money to support the education which they control. They want funds, and they want security against anything being taught which they consider dangerous. The Ministry gave them funds in the only way practicable, by annexing scholarships and fellowships to a University, and letting Catholics compete for them, and, if they could get them, hold them while members of purely Denominational colleges. There was nothing new in this. It was not exactly what the Catholic Bishops wanted in the way of funds, but it was the obvious and only way of getting fervent Catholics as much public money towards the cost of a University career as could be got. But it was not money only or chiefly that the Catholic Bishops wanted. They wanted the control of education, so that nothing dangerous to the Catholic faith might be taught to the tender lambs of their flocks. The secret of the Government, the mysterious device on the efficacy of which they relied, the special peculiarity of their Bill, was the mode in which they satisfied the claim of the Catholic Bishops just up to the right extent.

The Catholic Bishops claimed that nothing dangerous to their faith should be taught in the University. The Ministry agreed that all openly dangerous subjects should be avoided, and modern history and philosophy were altogether cut out. But this is only a small thing. Any subject, even, as an Irish Bishop seems to have thought, the multiplication-table, may be so used as to pervert the meek spirit of Catholic youth. To exclude dangerous subjects is not enough; the control of the study of innocent subjects must be added. The Ministry in effect replied that they could not give the control of the study of innocent subjects to the Catholic Bishops, but that they would give the Catholic Bishops a fair chance of getting this control, or an approach to it, if they and their friends would work for it. The machinery for effecting this was to place a large degree of control over the teaching of the University in the hands of a Council to which the professors should be under strict subjection, and that the Catholics should have a good chance of getting the command of this Council into their hands. The chief means were the suppression of Galway College, the lowering of the position of the remaining Queen's Colleges, and the right accorded to an unascertained number of little Catholic seminaries which succeeded, not in graduating, but merely in matriculating, a certain number of students, to have votes in the Council. To set up this approximation to purely Catholic teaching, giving it still a sort of undenominational character, and leaving Trinity with a position that would satisfy Protestants and the friends of mixed education, was the secret of the Government. It has failed to secure the support anticipated for it. It does not please the Ultramontanes, because, instead of funds, it gives them the chance of getting funds, and instead of giving them the control of education, it gives them the chance of getting this control. It does not please the opponents of the Ultramontanes, because they say that this similitude of an Ultramontane University is not a University worth having or belonging to. The only real question between the Ministers and their supporters is whether they will give up this peculiar device, will own that their mystery is a mistake, and cut out of the Bill its special feature. It is hard for men to do this, and it is not to be expected that they should do so readily and openly and at one effort. But little by little they have so cut into their scheme that they have left nothing much

remaining of it. They have successively declared that the extinction of Galway is not of the essence of the Bill, that the "gagging" clauses—that is, the clauses silencing teaching on dangerous subjects, and the dangerous teaching of innocent subjects—are not of the essence of the Bill, that very few seminaries shall be allowed to vote, and that the main qualification for a seat in the Council shall not be ecclesiastical position or power, but academical distinction. These concessions virtually amount to a withdrawal of the peculiar features of the Bill, and if once Liberal members can see that the scheme of setting up a pale copy of an Ultramontane University is abandoned, they have no cause for serious quarrel with the Government. That there should be funds accessible to Catholics residing in Denominational colleges, if they can win them by open competition with the members of other denominations, is quite fair; and such questions as whether there should be one University or two, important as they are, may be perfectly well settled in Committee.

#### PRESIDENT GRANT'S MESSAGE.

THE American PRESIDENT's Message to Congress on the commencement of his second term of office seems to be an ambitious document. Several of the domestic objects which he proposes to attain are beyond the competence of the Executive power; and his aspirations for the extension of the territory of the Union, and for the universal diffusion of Republican institutions, would be discourteous to all foreign States but for the obvious unconsciousness of the PRESIDENT that there is anything offensive in his language. The wish for a maintenance of friendly relations both with neighbouring and with distant States may probably be sincere, although several passages in the Message point directly to annexation. Utter incapacity to understand the sensitiveness of others is highly characteristic of American politicians. If an English QUEEN's Speech were to express a desire for the establishment of Constitutional Monarchy in the United States, the American people would be fully entitled to resent an impertinent interference. General GRANT is perfectly at liberty to hold the opinion that the civilized world is tending towards Republicanism; but it is quite unnecessary to anticipate in a formal State paper the eventual triumph of the DILKES and ODGERS of a country which is fully capable of managing its own affairs. "The Government, and through their representatives the people of our Great Republic, are," in General GRANT's opinion, "destined to be the guiding star of all other countries." Perhaps it would be as well that for the present the guiding star should begin by making its own light a little clearer. The advantage of being governed by TWEEDS, and COLFAXES, and BUTLERS is at this moment but faintly appreciated in England; nor is the cynical acknowledgment that unfounded claims were established at Geneva calculated to attract respect and admiration to the astuteness of the successful litigants. If General GRANT had unfortunately died a month ago, the head of the Government which is to be a guiding star to all nations would have been a person who lately accepted a paltry bribe, and who afterwards concealed his guilt by false statements. A Republican nominee for the Presidency has just been convicted in his absence by a French Court of Justice of a pecuniary fraud. The PRESIDENT himself scarcely displays the complete satisfaction which befits the chief of a perfect and ideal Republic. He complains that during his last electoral campaign he was the subject of abuse and slander scarcely ever equalled in history. He might have remembered that his own friends were at least as abusive and slanderous in their attacks on poor Mr. GREELEY; and that some of the abuse which was directed against powerful Republican leaders has, in spite of their denials, been fully supported by evidence. The habitual employment of personal vituperation in political contests is not in itself an attractive peculiarity of the American guiding star. Economists may be perhaps impressed by the undeniable fact that "the army and navy of the United States are less in number than those of any European Power;" but the PRESIDENT's further assertion that "there could be no extension of territory on this continent calling for an increase of military force" seems to require explanation. "Rather," he adds, "might such extension enable us to diminish it." As the island of Cuba can scarcely be considered a part of the American continent, the suggestion that an extension of territory might facilitate the reduction of the army and navy can only refer to one or both of the two conterminous territories. Continental extension must be effected, if at all, at the expense of Canada or Mexico. Neither the British Empire nor, as far as is known, the



Mexican Republic has any quarrel with the United States; and any other Government would shrink from the rudeness of hinting that annexation might produce a saving as well as a profit.

That the unseemly threat of annexation is not a mere flourish of patriotic eloquence is proved by a later part of the Message, in which the PRESIDENT recurs to his favourite policy of extension. He announces, indeed, that after his previous defeat on the question of San Domingo "the subject of the acquisition of territory must have the support of the American people before I recommend it"; but he proceeds to say, "I do not share the apprehension that there is a danger of Governments becoming weakened or destroyed by extension. As commerce, education, and the rapid transit of thought and matter by the telegraph and steam have changed everything, I rather believe that the GREAT MAKER is preparing the world to become one nation, speaking one language, a consummation which will render armies and navies unnecessary, and I will encourage and support any recommendation to Congress tending towards such ends." The modest taciturnity which has been popularly attributed to General GRANT has apparently covered the wildest dreams of national aggrandizement. The GREAT MAKER has often before been invoked for the sanction of ambition and lawless cupidity; but even the conquerors who have aimed at universal empire have never before announced their intention of simultaneously establishing a universal language. It seems that the American Union is to embrace the world, and that mankind is hereafter to speak only the Transatlantic dialect of English. The accomplishment of so marvellous a revolution would concern France and Germany and Italy more than England, which, as one of the humblest dependencies of the great Republic, will happily be able to understand and imperfectly to speak the dominant language of Bunkum. If bluster of this kind, uttered on a solemn occasion by the chief of a great nation, seems rather undignified than mischievous, the PRESIDENT's bombastic expressions have one practical application, inasmuch as they bode ill to the colonial empire of Spain. For some months past the American SECRETARY OF STATE has by his menacing despatches to the Spanish Government thrown impediments in the way of negro emancipation, and prepared the way for armed interference in Cuba. There is no reason to believe that the urgency of his representations has been relaxed since the proclamation of the Republic which the Government of the United States was so eager to recognize. It is incredible that the PRESIDENT should at this moment meditate any encroachment on Mexico, or on the Dominion of Canada; and therefore it may be inferred that his gratuitous apology for annexation is intended to prepare the way for aggression in Cuba. It remains to be seen whether either Congress or the people of the United States will support the PRESIDENT's policy. The unsatisfactory social and political condition of Cuba has lately been lucidly explained by one of the ablest Correspondents of the *Times*; and although General GRANT fails to understand how States can be weakened by extension, the degeneracy of the Creole population may well convey a warning to the would-be successors of Spain. If the descendants of Spaniards become feeble and effete in the climate of Cuba, there is no reason to suppose that settlers of Northern blood would be more fortunate in their posterity. The Spaniards from the old country must, in the event of an American contest, be exterminated or expelled from the island; and a million and a half of Spanish creoles and of barbarous negroes would not be an eligible body of citizens. It would be safer to try the first experiment on the worthless carcass of San Domingo, which, notwithstanding his protestations, the PRESIDENT has probably taken steps to acquire through the agency of the Samana Company. When the Spanish part of the island has been seized or bought, it will be necessary also to subdue the savages of Hayti; and before the whole territory is incorporated into the American Republic, the acquisition of Cuba will perhaps not be generally thought desirable.

Of the PRESIDENT's domestic policy foreigners are disinterested spectators and critics. It is evident from his enumeration of desirable measures that he has learned nothing of political economy from experience in affairs; but nearly all his projects are absolutely subject to the decision of Congress. It will hereafter appear whether American philanthropy is prepared to offer to the Indians the alternative of "civilization under the benign influence of education, or of war to extermination." It is wrong in aborigines or others to reject the benign influences of education; but it seems a strong measure to exterminate them by arms if they refuse to learn their lessons. In a generation or two the Indians will

be effectually exterminated without the necessity of massacre. At present Congress is utterly disinclined to provide for the construction of the PRESIDENT's "cheap routes," after the fashion of the Pacific Railroad. Cheap routes have come to mean lavish grants and bribes to Senators and Representatives, and it will not be thought expedient to provide occasions for further scandal. "The re-establishment of our commerce," and the recovery of our share of carrying trade on the "ocean," are phrases used by the PRESIDENT to express subsidies, protective duties, and other elaborate contrivances for counteracting the inevitable results of vicious legislation. In proposing to Congress "the encouragement of manufacturing industry" the PRESIDENT refers still more directly to the imposition or maintenance of differential duties in favour of domestic products. Although General GRANT is totally ignorant of the principles of commerce, he shows in his advocacy of a narrow and obsolete policy entire fidelity to his party. In the Republican declaration of principles at Philadelphia it was thought expedient to include a declaration in favour of protection to native manufacturers; and the present majority in the Senate and the House will probably adopt the PRESIDENT's recommendations. It is strange that General GRANT should fail to see the incompatibility of his commercial theories with his political prophecies. When the whole world has, under American supremacy, become one nation, speaking one language, not only armies and navies, but custom-houses, will disappear; yet it will be as ruinous for a Pennsylvanian ironmaster to compete with his fellow-citizens in Staffordshire and South Wales as to encounter the rivalry of the same manufacturers while they are still degraded subjects of a benighted Monarchy. It is scarcely to be supposed that the outlying European provinces of the universal Republic will be excluded from free intercourse with their metropolis of New York. On the whole, the Message displays neither dignity nor statesmanlike wisdom; but, as an exaggerated reproduction of popular prejudices and commonplaces, it is not improbable that it may command approval in the United States.

#### THE IRISH UNIVERSITY DEBATE.

THE Irish University Bill has come in for an unusual share of the ill-fortune which befalls measures which strive to steer between two extremes. Its adversaries on each side have their whole heart in the matter. The Ultramontanes hate all education which is not exclusively Denominational. The Secularists hate all education which is not exclusively undenominational. But they are content for the moment to lay by their hostility to one another in order to make common cause against a Government which supports a form of education from which neither Denominationalists nor Secularists shall be shut out. The Roman Catholic bishops and Mr. FAWCETT are impracticable and consistent. Those Conservatives who are for the time in alliance with them are impracticable without being consistent. The Roman Catholic bishops are Denominationalists alike in England and in Ireland; Mr. FAWCETT is a Secularist alike in England and in Ireland. It has been reserved for some of the Conservatives to discover that the distance between Denominationalism and Secularism is exactly measured by the distance between Holyhead and Kings-town. Their speeches on the English Education Act might edify the POPE; their speeches on the Irish University Bill must charm Mr. DIXON. The inappropriateness of Mr. BOURKE's amendment was shown by the fact that after his own speech there was hardly any reference to it in the debate. Mr. GLADSTONE showed by anticipation the impossibility of naming the Council until some certainty should have been attained as to the ultimate character of the Bill. Any number of different opinions may be held as to which parts of the Bill are principles by which the Government ought to stand or fall, and which are details that they may allow to be altered in Committee. At present there is not one of these opinions the holder of which can feel any assurance that it is the opinion of the Cabinet. The eminent persons to whom the Government might apply would hardly care to undertake in advance to manage the affairs of a University concerning the character and composition of which nothing can be certainly known. The doubts expressed by Mr. BOURKE as to the considerations by which the PRIME MINISTER will be guided in filling up the list of names may be perfectly well founded. But, if so, they called for a much stronger motion than that with which he concluded his speech. If the Government cannot be trusted to propose the persons who are to form the University Council in the first instance, they can hardly be trusted to constitute the University which the Council is to control. Even the supporters of the amendment virtually

acknowledged this by declaring that no list of names that could be constructed would remove their objections to the Bill.

The arguments used by the Roman Catholic members are merely amplifications of the resolutions adopted by the Irish Bishops on Friday week. They consist, in substance, of the complaint that Mr. GLADSTONE has recognized the Roman Catholic grievance without providing for it any adequate remedy. With a slight change of phrase this plea would be true. The Bill does recognize that the Irish Roman Catholics have a grievance, and it does not furnish what the Bishops consider an adequate remedy. But the grievance admitted by the Government is not the grievance under which the Bishops allege the Irish Roman Catholics to be suffering, and from this it naturally follows that the remedy provided by the Government is not the remedy demanded by the Bishops. The Bishops now complain that the Roman Catholic College in Dublin is not to be endowed. Perhaps after the review of the large endowments of Trinity College into which Mr. GLADSTONE was necessarily led in expounding the financial side of his measure, the Bishops are more inclined than formerly to think favourably of concurrent endowment. But if concurrent endowment ever had a chance of being adopted by Parliament, that chance has gone by. It would be as easy to make Roman Catholicism the established religion of Ireland, and to give Cardinal CULLEN a seat in the House of Lords, as to endow either a Catholic University or a Catholic College out of public money. It is to be observed, however, that though the Bishops denounce the injustice of giving large University endowments to Protestant Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Secularists, while none at all are given to Roman Catholics, they do not say that they will have nothing to do with the Bill unless this injustice be removed. They say that, as the legal owners of the Catholic University, they will not consent to its affiliation to the new University unless the proposed scheme be largely modified. But at the same time they pointedly refrain from committing themselves to the necessity of any particular modification. If the Bill satisfies the conscientious scruples of the Roman Catholic parents of Ireland, it will probably be found in the long run to satisfy the Bishops. That the Bill ought to satisfy the conscientious scruples of the Catholic parents of Ireland there can be no question. It gives them the power of sending their sons to a college belonging to their own Church without, as at present, having to forego the benefits of University training and degrees. The antagonism which has hitherto existed in their minds between the spiritual and the intellectual interests of their children will thus be laid to sleep. From the moment the Roman Catholic student matriculates at the University, it will rest with himself whether he shall participate fully in its endowments. He can obtain a bursary on entrance, he may supplement this by an exhibition, and when he has taken his degree he may replace his exhibition by a fellowship. Where is there anything in this process that can be injurious to the faith of any Catholic student? It is true that if he is sent to a Catholic college he will not find those collegiate endowments open to him which he would have found at Trinity College or at the Queen's Colleges. But, in comparison with the other, this is a very small grievance indeed. It is a grievance which touches nothing but the pocket, and as such it is one which it is useless to raise, except so far as the pocket is likely to benefit by the discussion. It can hardly escape intelligent Irish Roman Catholics that the only chance which they have of throwing out the Bill is by acting in concert with the Secularists and the Conservatives. Have they asked themselves to what use they propose to put their victory if they succeed in gaining it by this means? Their allies are opposed to the affiliation of Denominational Colleges on any terms; there is nothing, therefore, to be hoped from a new Ministry, whether Conservative or Radical. They cannot imagine that the Government will at the eleventh hour introduce into the Bill a clause endowing the Catholic College, since it is clear that any such attempt would send the bulk of the Liberal party into the Opposition lobby. All, therefore, that they can propose to themselves is to keep the controversy open, without the slightest chance of its being ever settled in a manner more to their mind.

Mr. HORSMAN has ascertained, since the 15th of February, that the whole end and purpose of the Bill was to satisfy the Irish Bishops, and that as soon as Mr. GLADSTONE discovered that his measure was in this respect a failure he ought at once to have withdrawn it. In the matter of deference to Bishops Mr. HORSMAN is a late convert, and, as converts will, he greatly overacts his part. If the Government had come forward in the first instance with an intimation that they had framed their

Bill with a careful attention to the requirements of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and that if it should prove insufficient for this purpose it would be immediately withdrawn, they would very properly have been sent about their business. No member of the Cabinet has ever said that the Roman Catholic Bishops, as such, have a grievance in the matter of University education; what has been said is that Roman Catholic parents have a grievance. Mr. HORSMAN denies the truth of this latter statement, and from that point of view his vote against the Bill is perfectly justified. But he would have been equally bound to vote against any Bill that the Government could have brought forward. Legislation resting on a falsehood must always be mischievous, and Mr. HORSMAN maintains that the statement that the Irish University system is not in all respects what the Roman Catholic laity wish it to be is an absolute falsehood. In the debates on the Irish Church Bill and the Irish Land Bill the Government were sometimes told that the only class in Ireland who had to be satisfied were the Fenians, and that, as the measure under discussion would do nothing towards contenting them, it would be utterly useless. The answer of the Liberal party used to be, that there was a great deal of discontent in Ireland which was not Fenian, but which furnished excellent material for Fenians to work upon, and that with this material out of the way the real weakness of their position would be apparent. A similar reply may be made to Mr. HORSMAN's argument that the Roman Catholic bishops are the only persons whom you have to satisfy, and that, since it is clear from their own resolutions that this Bill will not satisfy them, there is no use in going on with it. The supporters of the Bill believe that the absence of facilities for obtaining a University education and a University degree while resident in a College belonging to their own Church is a genuine cause of dissatisfaction to the Irish Roman Catholic laity, and that, if this is removed, one main source of the exaggerated influence which the Irish Bishops possess in educational matters will be dried up.

Mr. LOWE's announcement that the "gagging clauses" are not of the essence of the Bill was received with ironical cheers. The Opposition are so much in love with the meaning they have chosen to put on these clauses, that they refuse to believe that they could ever have been meant to bear any other. It may be doubted, however, whether even Mr. FAWCETT will maintain on further reflection that he would not retain his professorship for another hour unless he were allowed to give wilful offence to the religious convictions of his pupils. The truth is, that the restrictions involved in this clause and in the clause relating to examinations are tacitly imposed in every University which has students of different creeds. There is no reason to suppose that the Council of the proposed University will specially need to be reminded of them; but the Government naturally considered it of some importance, when dealing with suspicious and watchful adversaries—and for some time to come the Irish Bishops will be such—to give them no excuse for saying that the Roman Catholic religion is insulted in the University lecture-rooms, or that a belief in it weights a candidate unfairly in University examinations.

#### PROGRESS OF DISORDER IN SPAIN.

THE late King of SPAIN has by his abdication amply avenged himself for the fickleness and the insolence which had rendered his task intolerable. His retreat was consistent with personal prudence, if not with generosity or with heroism; but he may perhaps feel some compunction when he reflects that he is himself the only gainer by the change. The Republic which was proclaimed in sonorous phrases is regarded by its enemies and its most active friends as the equivalent of anarchy; and it would almost seem that Spanish society is in rapid process of dissolution. Even CASTELAR must begin to doubt whether the world can be governed by florid rhetoric. In concert with the other leaders of his party he had the courage to take possession of the Government at a moment when other parties were paralysed and helpless; and in the usual revolutionary fashion they assumed that all difficulties were overcome because the nominal change from a Monarchy to a Republic had been effected without civil war. With the tolerance and good humour of a successful faction in the moment of triumph the Republicans divided office with the Progressists, and they would have been willing for the present to continue the coalition; but the harmony which results from stupor only lasts for a day or two, and before a week had elapsed, the so-called Radicals were dismissed from office on the



demand of the rabble of Madrid. The Republican Government which remains is conscious that it retains the show of power subject to the pleasure of the mob. At the present time supreme authority has been ostensibly vested in the Cortes; but the majority which at first submitted to the Republican usurpation begins to recover courage, and a collision with the Government is imminent. FIGUERAS and his colleagues had resolved on the suspension of the sittings of the Assembly, and on the immediate convocation of a Constituent Cortes, three years after the date of the last Constitution. The members of the majority have resolved to reject the measure, and it remains to be seen whether the Ministers will, after going through the form of resignation, practically submit to a defeat. A Republic controlled by the professed enemies of the Republican system has been found temporarily possible in France, because supreme power is really vested in a PRESIDENT who commands general confidence. In Spain there is no THIERS, nor is the three weeks' old Republic theoretically provisional. It is difficult to understand how the Progressist majority of the Cortes can administer a Republic; and, on the other hand, a Republican Government will refuse to obey the majority. It seems inevitable that the contest should ultimately be decided either by the soldiery or by the mob. Without a leader, and without an armed force at its disposal, the Cortes and its President will be powerless. Of the composition or of the tendencies of a new Cortes it is impossible to form any confident anticipation. Within a year universal suffrage has given one majority to SAGASTA and the Conservatives, and another to ZORRILLA and the Progressists. It is possible that, under the administration of FIGUERAS and CASTELAR, the constituencies may prove to have become suddenly Republican; but the further doubt will remain which of the two Republics will be preferred.

The eventual substitution of military despotism for anarchy seems likely to be delayed in Spain by the dissolution of the army. The Republicans, when they were in opposition, denounced the conscription and all compulsory military service; and it now appears that they have succeeded in rendering the rank and file of the army thoroughly disaffected. An additional impulse to the mischievous spirit was given by the perverse policy of ZORRILLA and his Minister of War in their appointment of General HIDALGO to a command. HIDALGO had earned his rank by fostering a conspiracy of non-commissioned officers against their superiors; and his promotion was not unreasonably regarded by the officers of the Artillery as an insult. On their resignation of their commissions, the non-commissioned officers were appointed to the vacancies; and the same class in the Line are now demanding similar advancement. The officers of the army might be trusted to support the cause of order under the Republic, or under some other Government; but they now find themselves exposed to the menacing insubordination of their men, and desertion is becoming general. Like the Israelites of old, the Spaniards seem to assume that when there is no King in the land every man may do that which is right in his own eyes. The Government has done its best to promote disaffection in the army by ostentatiously distributing weapons among the dangerous classes of the community in the hope of providing the Republic with the means of defence against military conspiracies. The shopkeepers and other respectable inhabitants of Madrid are on their part arming and organizing themselves for the defence of their property against popular violence and spoliation. In several of the large towns and in some rural districts the rabble are denouncing the very existence of property; and many of the families which are threatened with plunder have already emigrated. Marshal SERRANO, though he is said to have offered his services to the Government, has thought it prudent to place his family in safety beyond the frontier. Any domestic inconvenience which he may suffer will have been amply deserved by the affront to King AMADEO which was thought to have been the immediate cause of his abdication. Marshal SERRANO is not known to have professed himself a Republican; but he can hardly contemplate the immediate re-establishment of royalty. The partisans of Don ALFONSO rested their hopes on the army, which is now thoroughly disorganized; and though they may perhaps have many supporters throughout Spain, the moderate part of the population will exercise little influence on affairs.

The Carlists are profiting with commendable activity by the disorganization of the unfortunate Republic. Although their successes are sedulously concealed by the official press of Madrid, and probably exaggerated by the Legitimist journals of Paris, there seems to be no doubt that the range of their

operations has been largely extended. Their reported victory at Irun is contradicted, and it seems that they have not yet besieged Pampeluna; but they have active partisans in Barcelona itself. A sentimental proclamation of the Republican Commander-in-Chief will probably have raised their hopes of success; and they can have little to fear from soldiers of the regular army who insist on being accompanied or escorted by Republican volunteers. It is probable that respectable Spaniards who have not the smallest sympathy with the Carlist cause may prefer any Pretender to the supremacy of bloodthirsty Communists. There can be little doubt that the Northern peasants and shepherds, who form the Carlist army, are the manliest race in Spain, if not the most enlightened. They are for the present able to defend their own soil against the demoralized troops of the Republic; but it appears hardly possible that they should march as conquerors into districts where they would be foreigners. If the Federal Republic succeeds in splitting up the Spanish territory into petty States, there seems to be no reason why a Legitimist Monarchy should not establish itself in the North; but a disruption which would be inconsistent with all the tendencies of modern civilization is not likely to be lasting. The Duke of MADRID who calls himself CHARLES VII. might probably succeed in ascending the throne of his ancestors, if he possessed the qualities of a soldier or a statesman; but he has taken no part in the contest which has been long sustained in his name, and the proclamations which he has from time to time published show that he or his advisers think it practicable to re-establish the orthodox despotism of the sixteenth century.

The most serious danger which threatens the Republic is not from its enemies, but from its zealous partisans. A handful of declamatory theorists may have arrived at a disinterested conviction that pure democracy, relieved from the incubance of a Court, will tend to purity of government; but the fighting men and the most active section of the party desire, under cover of the Republic, to overthrow all existing institutions. The armed volunteers of liberty will never fight for the maintenance of order, and they will find it pleasanter to intimidate their wealthier neighbours than to expose themselves to the hardships of a campaign against the Carlists. Eventually the better classes will rally against oppression, and they will give power to some vigorous soldier who may have shown himself able to protect them. Even if the existing standing army disappears, anarchy will lead to fighting, and by a process of natural selection the troops which are most efficiently disciplined will ultimately prevail. At the beginning of the French Revolution many regiments rose against their officers, and during the Reign of Terror no regular troops were employed in the suppression of internal disturbances, but at last the whole country found itself at the mercy of a victorious commander. Even the sailors of the Spanish navy are beginning to mutiny in imitation of the army; and for the present the country seems exposed to the risk of being left without defence. There is fortunately no danger of foreign interference, but the domestic prospect is one of unmitigated gloom. The course of revolution is almost always downhill. The days of ISABELLA II., notwithstanding the corrupt and discreditable character of the Court, must now be remembered with regret as an irrecoverable golden age. The revolution which was undertaken by PRIM, SERRANO, and TOPETE proves to have been a blunder, though its consequences were not immediately visible. The elaborately democratic Constitution of 1869 has not produced the smallest beneficial result, and it is now about to be superseded by some newer experiment. It would have been well to retain Queen ISABELLA, and afterwards to make the most of King AMADEO. A year hence a vain regret may be felt for the discontinuance of CASTELAR's eloquent discourses. With an impoverished Treasury and a mutinous army, the Republican Ministers will find themselves unable to conduct public business; and their places will probably be taken in the first instance by unscrupulous demagogues.

#### M. THIERS AND THE REPUBLIC.

IF M. THIERS had arranged matters with the express view of showing how indispensable it is that he should not be shut out from the tribune, they could not have fallen out better for his purpose. The debate on the Report of the Committee began on Thursday week, and by the following Tuesday he had been challenged to explain his position by four out of six sections of the Assembly. The Extreme Right and the Extreme Left knew how they were going to vote, but the

moderate men of both parties and the two Centres were in a state of utter confusion. The Right Centre had had time to get over the failure of the attempt to form a united monarchical party, and were consequently racked by doubts whether they had not yielded too much to M. THIERS. M. DUFAURE's speech on Saturday made everything straight with this section of the Chamber, but it did so at the cost of alienating the Left Centre. M. DUFAURE brought the Bordeaux Compact back to life, and as the Bordeaux Compact was understood to have been repudiated by the PRESIDENT in his Message at the beginning of the Session, its resurrection was accepted as involving a recantation of M. THIERS's declarations in favour of a Republic. It is true that M. DUFAURE reminded the Right that, whether they liked the fact or not, they were living under a Republic; that its effigy was stamped on their money; that the laws which they obeyed were promulgated in its name; that it had been as its agents that the Government had treated with all the Powers of the world. But he treated the question whether the provisional Republic should be succeeded by an established Republic or by a Monarchy as still open, and in this respect there was sufficient apparent contrast between his language and the language of the Message to confirm the fears of the Left Centre. On Saturday there was no time for their uneasiness to come to a head. The Assembly divided the same afternoon, and decided by 472 votes against 199 to go into Committee upon the Report. Between Saturday and Tuesday, however, M. RICARD and his friends seem to have determined that they could not continue to vote with the Government unless M. THIERS would clear up the uncertainty in which they had been left by M. DUFAURE. There was no room for a simple repetition of the tactics which were so successful on the occasion of M. DUFAURE's former speech. If M. THIERS merely delivered his Message over again, as he did before the Committee of Thirty, the gain of the Left Centre would at once be counterbalanced by the defection of the Right Centre. M. THIERS's object was to keep both in good humour, and when he left the tribune he had achieved what looked like an impossibility when he entered it. His speech was a masterpiece of Parliamentary skill. He began by making M. DUFAURE's words his own. The KEEPER of the SEALS had expressed the true sentiments of the Government. But the pressing questions which had been addressed to him made it necessary to add something to what M. DUFAURE had said. It was quite true that the Bordeaux Compact was still in force. That Compact found the Republic in being, and it imposed upon all parties the duty of maintaining it. It pledged the Executive to connive at no monarchical conspiracies. It pledged the Right not to abandon their preference for monarchical government, but to hold that preference in suspense so long as the Compact lasts. It pledged the Left not to treat the establishment of the Republic as something that might or might not come to pass, but simply to postpone the proclamation of it out of deference for the conscientious opinions of those of their fellow-countrymen who still prefer Monarchy. The ingenuity of this reasoning is really wonderful. The Left are conciliated by the frankest admission that it was a Republic that was entrusted to M. THIERS's keeping at Bordeaux, and that it is a Republic that he will have to restore intact to the country. Yet the Right cannot quarrel with this way of describing the facts, because it is admitted that they are free to accept or reject the Republic hereafter, and they have never claimed for themselves the right of attempting to overthrow it now. What did the Bordeaux Compact mean, M. THIERS says in effect, if it did not mean what I have told you? It did not purport to maintain an interregnum or period of absolute equilibrium between all forms of Government, for the Provisional Government voted by the Assembly at the same time that the Bordeaux Compact was entered into was christened the Republic. It certainly did not fix any date for a return to Monarchy, for it was called the truce between parties, and the Republican party would never have assented to a truce which was to become a Restoration by mere lapse of time. All it could have meant, therefore, was the maintenance of the Republic in the form in which it then legally existed. This is all that the Right can demand, for it leaves them unfettered as regards the future, and the very notion of a truce implies a certain abnegation of liberty of action as regards the present. It is all that the Left can demand, for it secures the maintenance of the Republic as long as the existing Assembly is in being, and when a dissolution comes they will be in a position to take care of themselves. In the division which immediately followed M. THIERS's speech the numbers were almost identical with those in the former

division. But the effect of the speech is not to be measured by this fact alone. The tone of the Republican journals has become much more moderate since its delivery, and there is every chance that the party will continue as heretofore to draw a broad distinction between the majority which supports M. THIERS and M. THIERS himself.

Now that the effort to satisfy both parties has been made, and to all appearance made successfully, it may seem strange that M. THIERS should ever have had it in his mind not to make it. The Paris Correspondent of the *Times*, however, says positively that nothing but a remonstrance from Berlin prevented the PRESIDENT from proclaiming the Republic in a way which would have alienated the mass of the Right Centre, while securing him the united support of the Left. As matters have turned out, he has secured nearly the whole Right without alienating the Left, except in name, and we naturally wonder why he should have thought the other combination better. Two things, however, have to be remembered. In the first place, the work which M. THIERS had cut out for him when he entered the tribune on Tuesday was one of extraordinary difficulty, and while still in ignorance whether it would not prove beyond his power of performance, he might reasonably have preferred to take an easier and less ambitious course. To please all parties is the happiest lot that can befall a Minister, but it falls to the lot of so few that a man may be excused for not aiming at it except under the stress of imperious necessity. In the second place, it is by no means certain that M. THIERS would have been so successful had not the motives which determined his policy been known or suspected. The Left cannot feel any real hostility to a PRESIDENT who would have cast in his lot with them had it been compatible with his paramount duty of liberating France from the German army at the earliest possible moment. They might have distrusted his interpretation of the Bordeaux Compact if he had maintained that Compact of his own free choice; but as soon as it was understood to be forced upon him by considerations of the highest policy, the explanations by which he deprived it of significance were at once recognized as merely ingenious exercises in casuistry. The Right might have been less willing to put up with a distribution of parts which assigns to them a possible future, and to their opponents an actual present, if they had not known that even this concession had been extorted from M. THIERS against his will, and that their power over him depended wholly on the exigencies of foreign policy. The result of these composite influences will probably be to make M. THIERS once more the undisputed master of the Assembly. How long he will remain so must depend in some measure on the nature of the Bills which he has undertaken to bring forward. That these measures will be framed in a sense distasteful to the Republican party is highly improbable. Even the Right are beginning to acknowledge that the present Assembly cannot be kept in being when once the occupied territory is set free; and with a dissolution in prospect, M. THIERS will have every day less motive for gaining the goodwill of a majority which has so short a time to live. The construction of a Second Chamber will certainly be distasteful to the Left; but, with the example of all Europe before him, it will be strange if M. THIERS does not succeed in making it too powerless to provoke serious enmity.

#### RAILWAY PROPERTY.

SINCE the panic of 1866 railway property has not been exposed to so heavy and so sudden a decline in price as since the beginning of the present year. The fall is out of all proportion to the reduction in the intrinsic value of railway stocks, and those who have not been obliged to sell will probably soon recover the greater part of their nominal loss; but scarcely any department of industry has been so seriously affected by the high price of coal and by the general rise of wages. On some railways the additional cost of fuel for locomotive power has absorbed the whole of the dividend, and in almost every instance it has either reduced the dividend or rendered it stationary, notwithstanding a large increase of traffic. The London and North-Western Company, with an addition to its gross receipts as compared with the corresponding half-year of 1871 of 230,000*l.*, paid a quarter per cent. less dividend, the excess in the cost of locomotive fuel having amounted to almost exactly the same sum. The Great Western Company stands almost alone in the good fortune of paying an improved dividend, in consequence perhaps of the adoption during the past year of the narrow



gauge on the greater part of its system. The rise in the Lancashire and Yorkshire dividend is attributed to the division of profits which has been arranged with the London and North-Western Company, in anticipation of a Parliamentary amalgamation. If the statement is well founded, the allied Company must have suffered in proportion, and any one of its shareholders might enforce a reopening of the accounts by legal proceedings. Moderate fluctuations in the income of railway shareholders would scarcely deserve general attention, if the prosperity of the carrying trade were not intimately connected with the industrial and commercial condition of the country. The railway returns show, not that the amount and profit of business are declining, but that their expansion has been seriously checked. A portion of the increase in gross traffic returns represents the advance in the rates on goods which has been adopted on the principal railways, and nevertheless the percentage of increase is less than in 1871. In the current half-year the still higher price of coal will bear heavily both on the profits and on the traffic of railways, but it may be hoped that the other elements of increased working expenses have reached their highest point. An average rise during one year of fourteen per cent. in the cost of working railways would be alarming if it were likely to be repeated. In the majority of cases the additional expenses have absorbed the whole proceeds of the increased traffic. A continuation of the same process would induce the Companies to diminish the accommodation which is now for the most part liberally supplied.

The complaint that the increase of railway traffic, or of any other kind of business, is checked, affords a curious illustration of the confidence which is felt in the elasticity of the national resources. As the percentage of increase is calculated every year on a larger and larger amount, the maintenance of the same rate would imply that wealth and industry were growing in a geometrical ratio. There is no apparent reason why the demands of consumers should increase year by year, although production is naturally stimulated by previous prosperity. But for the unexpected rise in working expenses, railway dividends for the second half-year of 1872 would have been the highest ever known; and shareholders would have had no reason to be dissatisfied if they had afterwards remained for a time stationary. The recent fall in the price of shares proves, so far as it is not the result of irrational panic, that the market value had included an estimated rise in future dividends. It will generally be found that the ratio of the price of shares to the present return on the capital invested varies inversely with the amount of the dividend. Stock on which no dividend is paid is sometimes worth forty or fifty per cent., while a five per cent. stock is scarcely at par. Some capitalists on both a large and a small scale prefer more or less speculative investments to nominally fixed incomes which are liable to be reduced by a fall in the value of money. If the railways were purchased by the State, only a portion of the present holders of ordinary stock would be contented to accept the Government stocks which would be created for the purpose of the undertaking. Writers on political economy have often noticed the inconvenience which resulted in former times from the want of opportunities for investment in public funds. Similar embarrassments would be caused by a sudden curtailment of facilities for engaging in partially speculative undertakings. It is not the business of a Legislature to provide capitalists with employment for their funds; but in discussing the expediency of vesting the property of railways in the State, it might be worth while to consider that half the capital which now provides railway accommodation might be applied to other purposes if the owners were deprived of all prospect of an increase in the value of their property.

There is no doubt that, if the material progress of the country continues, the value of railway property will, with occasional variations, on the whole tend to advance. The uninterrupted experience of half a century, and the more rapid improvement of the last twenty years, had until lately created an almost universal impression that commercial and industrial prosperity grew by a kind of natural law. The great monetary disturbances which have recurred at intervals of eight or ten years affected the distribution of wealth rather than its accumulation. Manufactures have been occasionally checked because markets have been temporarily glutted; but, as soon as the obstruction was removed, the demand has invariably revived. The extreme depression of railway stock which lasted for three or four years after the crisis of 1866 was principally caused by vicious financial arrangements, and in some cases by premature prosecution of enterprises

which might not be immediately remunerative. Almost all the larger Companies paid in the worst of times a dividend on their ordinary stock; and even when the fixed charges were not fully covered by the revenue, there was generally but a small margin of deficiency. As soon as traffic began to increase, the ordinary proprietors had reason to appreciate the advantage of arrangements under which they reaped the entire benefit of an income which might have afforded but a fractional dividend on the entire capital. The stock of the Great Western Company, which has a large proportion of preference stock, is, even after the recent decline, worth three times as much as in 1867. London and North-Western stock, with a similar increase of traffic, has in the same time risen about thirty per cent. The causes which at this moment have checked the prosperity of railways are more substantial, and may be more permanent, than the disturbances which formerly indicated administrative mismanagement. The wages which have been raised are not likely hereafter to be reduced; and the increase of the staff, which results from a diminution in the hours of work, will impose a permanent burden on the Companies. The danger which was apprehended by the acting Chairman at the London and North-Western meeting from the provisions of Mr. FORTESCUE'S Railway Act is not that the total earnings of railways will be affected, but that some Companies may obtain an unjust advantage at the expense of their neighbours. There is no reason to doubt that a common interest will unite the more powerful Companies against interlopers who may seek to derive undue advantage from the provisions of the Bill. Compulsory through rates can only apply to traffic which is handed over from one Company to another; and litigious claimants will probably find, when they attempt to enforce the rate, that goods are forwarded in some other direction. Parliament would not be unwilling to remedy any practical injustice which might arise from a legislative miscarriage. It would be impolitic as well as iniquitous to discourage enterprise by depriving capital invested in railways of its due return; nor would there be any temptation to favour one competitor at the expense of another. Not a mile of railway in the kingdom has been constructed in expectation of a compulsory through rate with a neighbouring system; nor was any such arrangement contemplated in the Act of 1853, which is to be rendered effective by the institution of the new tribunal.

At nearly every railway meeting during the present year directors and shareholders have protested against the passenger tax, and more especially against the discontinuance of the partial exemption which was allowed in respect of Parliamentary trains. Under the existing law a Company is not liable to the tax on third-class passengers conveyed by a train which stops at every station. Within the last year the Companies have all, following the example of the Midland Company, attached third-class carriages to all their trains. A needy passenger can now travel from Edinburgh or Glasgow to London in ten or eleven hours, instead of wasting more than twice the time on the road. Unfortunately the Inland Revenue authorities have discovered that the improved accommodation deprives the Companies of the exemption from duty, and thus far the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER has not pledged himself to remove the flagrant anomaly. Ingenious official persons argue that the exemption was conceded on the assumption that third-class traffic would be unprofitable; and they plausibly conjecture that the recent liberality of the Companies is not exclusively prompted by pure benevolence. Sound policy would suggest that taxation should not be so adjusted as to discourage even an interested promotion of the public convenience. The whole of the passenger-tax is an anomaly, inasmuch as no corresponding tax is now imposed on any other kind of locomotion; and Mr. LAING will be fully justified in bringing, in accordance with his notice, the whole question before the House of Commons. Mr. Lowe is unluckily at all times indispensed to part with any item of revenue; and when he proposed two or three years ago to abolish the passenger-tax, he substituted a still more obnoxious burden on railways. He may perhaps feel a doubt whether the remission of the tax would lead to a reduction of fares at a time when Companies require additional funds to meet their working expenses. He may defend his possible obstinacy by referring to the fact that postmasters have not taken a penny off their charges since the abolition of the special duty on post-horses and carriages. Financiers seldom cultivate a passion for symmetry, except when the bed of PROCRUSTES requires to be lengthened and not to be shortened.

## DIFFICULTIES OF EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT.

AS the Madrid papers would say, "Tranquillity reigns" in Europe; and it is true that Europe generally is rather better off than Spain in this respect, and that the reign of tranquillity north of the Pyrenees means something rather better than a panic-stricken Government, disordered provinces, and interrupted communications. Yet the tranquillity reigning in Europe is so far like that reigning in Spain that in most parts of Europe it is a tranquillity under the surface of which many causes of anxiety exist. There is scarcely any portion of Europe in which those charged with the conduct of affairs do not feel that they have a heavy burden laid on them. Hope may largely prevail over apprehension, as it certainly does in England and Germany or Russia, and as it may perhaps be said to do even in France and Italy. Still every European State has its difficulties and dangers, and it is strange how very much the aspect of the difficulties and dangers is everywhere the same. We need not go into remote causes of anxiety, or into dangers lying much below the surface; for, although remote and hidden sources of danger, such as the apparent divergence of the interests of capital and labour, or the break-up of old faiths, or the too rapid acquisition of power by persons unfit to use it, are really of very great importance, yet practical statesmen are necessarily content to think of and attend to the dangers which actually press on them, and to provide as well as they can for each day as it passes without being very anxious about the future. The patent and superficial dangers of European Governments, which are everywhere more or less present, are the danger of debt, the danger of religious difference, and the danger of disintegration. We may use these three dangers as a test or standard of the position of each nation in turn, and ask how severely they are pressing, and how far one or two, or all three of them, are making themselves felt. In unhappy Spain all three are presenting themselves at the same time with alarming force. Spain has no money—owing much, and having no available resources; it is torn with a civil war based on religious differences; and it is being propelled in the direction of a Federal Republic. England has no cause of anxiety whatever with regard to money; it has a gigantic debt, but it is a debt which does not press at all in the sense in which the debts of struggling Continental nations press on them. Germany again is free from all pecuniary trouble, but then both Germany and England have the danger of religious differences and the danger of disintegration. They are dangers, in our own country, showing themselves in the mildest possible form, but with a Ministry trembling in the balance on a University Bill designed to compromise religious differences, and with a movement for Irish Home Rule which, if it does no further harm, may cause considerable disturbance in the machinery of party government, we cannot say that we are quite easy on the score of religious differences and of disintegration. Russia, on the other hand, is free from religious difficulties; for it has resorted with success to the simple process of stamping them out. But disintegration and debt are matters which the Russian Government has seriously to consider. Not that there is any but a slight danger to Russia from these sources, but still there is some. France again is exposed to all the three dangers. The new taxes will soon begin to press heavily, the South of France is always giving vague signs of a wish for something like separation, and the quarrel between the friends and the enemies of the Papacy is chiefly repressed by the memories of the recent war. France is a great and strong country full of resources, with a general addiction to centralization, and with many traditions and habits that would make it averse to a war for a religious idea. There is every hope that France will overcome its dangers, but France is in trouble just now because those dangers do press on it, while England and Russia are not in trouble because some of these dangers do not press at all on them, and the others press only very slightly.

It is in a large degree this solidarity, as the French would say, of European countries from being exposed to the same dangers, that contributes to each the chief source of interest in foreign politics. German politics are not, for example, as a rule, very interesting to Englishmen, nor have we much to do with the affairs of Austria. But the politics of Germany become of real importance to us when we find that the most stirring incident in them just now is the great quarrel between the State and the Church of Rome, which is reflected on a small scale in the collision of opinion that the current debate on the Irish University Bill brings to light; and the cry for Home Rule in Ireland is a sufficient inducement to

watch the Austrian Reform Bill with attention. The three measures of the Prussian Government, which together formed its great battery against its clerical enemies, had to be delayed in their progress because it was ascertained that they contravened certain parts of the Prussian Constitution. The necessary amendments to the Constitution have now received the sanction of the Lower Chamber, and no apprehension exists as to the willingness of the Upper House, which is about to meet for the purpose, to adopt them with equal readiness. A Committee of the Lower Chamber has already busied itself with the details of the three Bills, and a steady and unvarying majority is sure to support them in that assembly, although there may not improbably be some attempt made in the Upper Chamber to modify them. Still it may be expected that they will pass without much alteration, and then Prince BISMARCK will have got all the means of combating the Ultramontanes which he has been able to devise. A Report has recently been issued showing that all the Jesuit establishments throughout the German Empire have been broken up, and a list has been published of those institutions which the authorities have decided are of a character too allied to that of the Jesuits to remain unmolested. So far, therefore, as the making and the enforcing of stringent laws will carry Prince BISMARCK, he may see his way to proceeding. But the difficulties which he and his friends will have to encounter are perhaps only beginning. We may leave out of consideration those wearisome disputes which the opposition of the priests will foment in every quarter of Prussia, the martyrdom which they will court and make the most of, the pitfalls which they will adroitly dig for their enemies when a harsh measure has to be applied in numberless small instances by minor officials. The Prussian Cabinet has braved the Ultramontanes, and of course has dared them to do their worst. But it is the peculiar annoyance of the religious difficulty that, whatever solution statesmen attempt to find for it, they always run the risk of alienating friends quite as much as they secure the hope of hurting their adversaries. The measures of the Government apply, of course, to Protestants as well as to Catholics; and the Pietist party among the Prussian Protestants, which is very powerful in high places, cries out that it is very hard that it should be placed under a new bondage to the State while it is thoroughly loyal simply because another religious body is supposed to be disloyal. Those, too, who approve theoretically of religious liberty in its extreme form, and want the Church and the State to be disunited, protest against measures which give a disciplinary power over the ministers of religion to laymen who may be utterly unconnected with their communion; while the advocates of complete free thought in the Universities feel an alarm which is not unreasonable at the proposal, forming part of the Ministerial scheme, to force every minister of religion to go through a University training. This might do the ministers of religion good, but it might do the Universities harm; for it is obvious that a pressure might easily be put on the Government not to force the future ministers of religion to have a University training and at the same time to let their training be of a kind which would shake or wound their religious belief.

The Austrian Reform Bill, which has this week been passed by the Lower House of the Reichsrath, is, it is scarcely necessary to say, a Bill for transferring the election of members of the Reichsrath from the Provincial Diets to the body of electors in the provinces. It substitutes direct for indirect election. It also involves a considerable change in the balance of political power by a redistribution of the number of deputies that the several provinces are to return. It is not necessary to enter into the reasons which have induced the Ministry to propose the Bill, so far as they are of a local character; but there are some of these reasons which are of a very wide application, and are well worth studying by those persons whose attention the Home Rule movement has attracted. Austria is a federation of provinces, each having a local Home Rule, and all combining to send persons to a Central Assembly controlling Imperial affairs. The Austrian Government finds that this state of things is very unsatisfactory. It seeks to get away from those disintegrating influences which Federalism fosters, and it does so in a very large degree because it finds that the Empire is sacrificed to its parts. The local Diets absorb the energy of the provinces, narrow their political horizon, and make them regard the whole of which they are supposed to be parts as something non-existent or inimical. If the Provincial Diets fairly represent the provinces, it might seem that the best chance of getting good deputies to the Central Assembly would be to let the Diets elect them. It is in this way that the Senate of the United States is elected, and the method



has been a success. But in Austria there is not enough coherence between the different provinces to make them look on any Central Assembly as superior to their own. The Provincial Diets consequently elect, in many instances, knots of representatives of the majority who go to Vienna to act together as a caucus or clique, to give as much trouble as possible, and, instead of helping to carry on the affairs of an Empire, to make Imperial always subordinate to provincial interests. The population of the provinces knows nothing about the Empire as a whole, and has no notion of Austrian policy or Austrian interests; the deputies of the Diets are only hardened in provincialism by their collision with the Central Government, and the Central Government has to expend its energies in bribing, or overpowering, or cajoling local cliques. A federation safe from external danger, like the United States or Switzerland, might, Austrian statesmen would allow, go on under such circumstances, but not an Empire such as the Austrian Empire must be, to exist at all. For such an Empire it is necessary that there should be something of an Imperialist feeling in the provinces, and therefore, they urge, there must be direct election, so that the humblest subjects of the EMPEROR may have it brought home to them that their Provincial Diet is by no means the only thing to be considered. Whether the remedy proposed in Austria will be adequate to the evil to be cured is very uncertain; but the dwarfing tendency of federalism, to the detriment not only of the higher forms of the body politic, but still more to that of the bulk of the people, who become absorbed in provincialism, is a point which the current history of Austria brings into strong relief.

#### MR. PLIMSOLL'S MOTION.

THE best excuse perhaps for the somewhat sensational tone of Mr. PLIMSOLL'S book is that it has apparently answered its purpose. For some years past Mr. PLIMSOLL has been vainly endeavouring to obtain an inquiry into the loss of merchant ships at sea. He has more than once brought the subject before the House of Commons, but the shipowners were against him, and the Board of Trade could not think of countenancing such an unjustifiable interference with the liberty of the subject. Sir J. PAKINGTON also took up the matter and moved for a Royal Commission; but still the House was cold and the Government hostile. Now, however, we find that everybody has suddenly become convinced that a searching inquiry is urgently required, and it would almost seem as if the only difficulty were how to make the inquiry searching enough to satisfy the impatient shipowners. What has happened to bring about this strange revulsion of opinion? Nothing that we know of except the publication of Mr. PLIMSOLL'S extremely plainspoken book. The practices of which he complains have been carried on for years and years, and are sufficiently notorious. They are attested by the protests of seamen, the complaints of the underwriters, the official records of the Board of Trade, and by an overwhelming accumulation of other evidence from a great variety of independent sources. It may be doubted whether the Commission which is to be appointed will add very much to what is already known, but it will put the information into a more precise and authoritative form, and above all it will stir up public opinion, and so bring an amount of pressure to bear upon the Government which may perhaps compel it to take up the matter seriously. This is, in fact, what Mr. PLIMSOLL'S book has already done to some extent. Whether legislation conceived and carried out under the influence of popular excitement is likely to be a good thing is another question. Mr. PLIMSOLL may at least plead that the timidity of the Government and the indifference of the House of Commons forced him to appeal to the public out of doors as the only chance of getting anything done, and that he has thus succeeded in obtaining what was previously denied him. The Government has agreed to Mr. PLIMSOLL'S motion for a Commission of Inquiry, with some modifications. The subjects for inquiry will be, as stated by Mr. C. FORTESCUE, overloading, unseaworthiness—whether from defective construction, condition, equipment, or age—deck-loading, undermanning, and marine insurance; and the Commission is to report as to the best measures for remedying any evils which may be found to exist. Mr. CLAY moved an amendment to the effect that the Commission should be empowered to take evidence on oath, but it was pointed out that this could only be done by passing a Bill, which would lead to delay, and that it would be more convenient to set the Commission to work as soon as possible. A sort of half promise was held out that, if the Commission, after it had made some pre-

liminary inquiries, and had felt its ground, thought that power to administer oaths was necessary, the Government would bring in a Bill for that purpose, as well as for compelling the attendance of witnesses, and indemnifying them against the consequences of their disclosures. It must be tolerably obvious, however, that it is hardly worth while to appoint a Commission to go about collecting mere offhand volunteer evidence. If the inquiry is to be of any value, it should be searching and exhaustive, and the only way in which it can be made searching and exhaustive is by giving it ample judicial authority. If the whole affair is not to be an empty form, this will have to be done sooner or later, and it might therefore as well be done at once. The passing of a Bill would take only a week or two, and time would be saved hereafter.

We must confess that the hesitation of the Government with regard to evidence being taken on oath and to protecting witnesses, and the deprecatory remarks which were made as to following up what are called personal questions, inspire us with some misgivings as to the sincerity and thoroughness of the promised investigation. Mr. PLIMSOLL, if he is not on his guard, will perhaps find that his supposed victory is more nominal than real, and that the inquiry by a Commission is intended rather to screen than to disclose. Mr. C. FORTESCUE said it was not desirable, in his opinion, to have a semi-judicial inquisitorial investigation into the conduct or misconduct of individuals. Again, Mr. PEEL, the Secretary of the Board of Trade, expressly desired the House to "observe that this inquiry was not to be extended to the conduct of particular individuals," and he blamed Mr. PLIMSOLL for having imported personal charges into his book. In order to appreciate the bearing of these observations it is necessary to remember how matters now stand. Mr. PLIMSOLL asserts that there are certain shipowners who habitually send out crews to be drowned in unseaworthy ships, and that it is the homicidal cupidity of men of this class which causes a large proportion of the losses of life at sea. Now this is a very grave and even terrible charge. If Mr. PLIMSOLL has made it lightly, on the strength of mere rumour or loose hearsay evidence, he has done the men whom he denounces a grievous wrong. On the other hand, if he can prove his charge, he will, at some peril to himself, have rendered a most important service to the country. It is certainly not desirable that personal matters should be introduced into the discussion of public matters with which they have no sort of connexion; but here the personal matters are the very essence of the case. Mr. PLIMSOLL is not content with saying in general terms that there is criminal recklessness in sending out rotten or over-loaded vessels; he says that he knows, and that others know, who the men are who do these things, and he even goes very near to naming them. We have already expressed our opinion that, from one point of view, Mr. PLIMSOLL'S book is not quite personal enough. In justice to shipowners against whom he has nothing to allege, as well as in justice to the accused persons, who are entitled to have an opportunity of defending themselves, he should, we think, have specified more clearly the particular "sinners" against whom his charges are directed. It appears that in one instance Mr. PLIMSOLL will have to defend himself against a criminal information for libel; but the investigation of charges of this kind ought not to be left absolutely at the choice of the accused. It seems to us that the propriety or impropriety of Mr. PLIMSOLL'S charges really turns upon whether they are true; and how their truth is to be tested without going into the "conduct or misconduct of individuals" it is not easy to understand. What the Commissioners will have to do will be to inquire into the causes of shipwreck, whether such a ship was sound, or sufficiently manned, or properly laden; at every turn they will find themselves running their heads against personal questions. Are we to understand from Mr. C. FORTESCUE'S explanation that it will be their duty, when this happens, immediately to stop short in their inquiry and look another way for fear they should hurt anybody's feelings? Mr. FORTESCUE remarked that there was no precedent for a Commission with power to summon witnesses and to take evidence on oath, "except where individual misconduct was directly at issue," as, for example, in the case of the Trade Unionists at Sheffield. We should have thought that the case of a shipowner who is charged with drowning five or six crews a year in the ordinary course of business comes very near to being something like "individual misconduct." When the Sheffield Commission was appointed the working-men complained that it was only against their class that such inquiries were directed. The

Government will now have an opportunity of showing that no distinction is made between gentlemen shipowners and common sawgrinders when alleged criminal practices have to be investigated. Shipowners who do not send out rotten or overlaiden ships have no reason to resent a searching investigation; those who are suspected of being guilty in this way, but who are really innocent, cannot fail to welcome it. What is wanted is not a nicely balanced Commission of shipowners, shipbuilders, naval officers, and members of Parliament who will just skim over the surface of things and produce a vague report of a highly impersonal character, but a Commission of experienced and independent lawyers who may be trusted to get at the facts, and who will not be afraid of bringing anybody's misconduct to light.

It will be exceedingly unfair to the shipowners if, after all that has been said, the manner in which the inquiry is to be conducted does not inspire general confidence. It must be remembered that the PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE has not ventured to quarrel with Mr. PLIMSOLL's statements. He corrects some of his figures, hints that in some points he may have been misled, but accepts the substance of the indictment as indisputable. Only, he says, let us keep clear of personal questions. Mr. FORTESCUE, like the American politician, is willing to go pretty strongly against wrong in the abstract:—

But we mustn't be hard on partickler sins,  
Cuz then we get kickin' the people's own shins.

Except for what is called quasi-judicial purposes, there is really no reason for having a Commission at all. For all the purposes of practical legislation a sufficient body of evidence has already been collected. What is required is courage to act on it. There is a clause in the Act of 1871 which, though mild enough in itself, points in the right direction. It is thereby provided that every person who, having authority as owner or otherwise, sends a ship to sea in an unseaworthy state, so as to endanger the life of any person belonging to the same, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, unless—and here the latter part of the clause proceeds to qualify and neutralize the first part—he proves that he used all reasonable means to make and keep the ship seaworthy and was ignorant of such unseaworthiness, or that her going to sea in an unseaworthy state was under the circumstances reasonable and unavoidable. It will be observed that the clause does not say whether the unseaworthiness includes the weight and stowing of the cargo as well as the condition of the ship, and the permission to send an unseaworthy ship to sea if the owner thinks it "reasonable" opens the door for anything and everything. There would be no difficulty in shaping a short, sharp, and simple clause of this kind which would really fasten responsibility on the owner for the loss of a ship. At present the system of insurance may well render the owner indifferent to the fate of the vessel, sometimes even rather desirous never to see it again. What is wanted is to find some means of making it better worth the while of an owner to keep his ships in a seaworthy condition than to send them to sea in an unsound or overlaiden state. A limitation of the amount of insurance is impracticable, since it could easily be evaded; but in some other way a penalty might be imposed for the loss of a ship, unless it could be shown to have been due to unavoidable causes. Merchant seamen, as Mr. FORTESCUE observed, are not a perfect race, and it would be dangerous to assume that they are invariably in the right when they question the soundness of a ship and refuse to go in her. It is obvious, however, that the statutory right of a common seaman to claim a survey at his own expense is simply a mockery of protection. It can hardly be doubted that deck loads should be placed under stringent regulations, and the proposal of the Institute of Naval Architects to mark on the side of each ship amidships the point at which a horizontal plane would cut off one-fourth of her internal capacity, as a guide on the question of loading, deserves at least careful consideration.

#### THE THREE RIGHT HONOURABLES.

THE present Government, as is well known, is a Government that must not be laughed at, and it may readily be conceived that at the present moment especially Ministers are by no means in the humour for a joke. Mr. GLADSTONE remarked at the Croydon dinner that it might perhaps occur to some of his hearers to speculate as to what sort of region the Government lived in; but he was probably not aware that at that very hour a large audience was laughing at an amusing picture of himself and some of his colleagues getting up a democratic revolution in the "Happy Land" of the fairies. Those who remember that a couple of years since the LORD

CHAMBERLAIN directed that the slightest allusion to Mr. Lowe and the match-tax should be mercilessly excised from the pantomimes, must have been rather surprised to find that a few days ago a burlesque had been produced at one of the theatres, with the approval of that august but somewhat bewildering functionary, in which there were not only allusions to Ministers and their policy, but in which three members of the Government were actually introduced upon the stage, for the purpose of being chaffed and ridiculed. The three Right Honourables, it is true, were not named in the bill, but their dress, features, and demeanour, as imitated by the actors, left no doubt as to the personages with whom they were intended to be identified. The audience had no difficulty in discovering that the Privy Councillors who had come up to fairy land to try the experiment of popular government in a new sphere were no others than the PRIME MINISTER, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and the FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS, and the reckless profanity of the audacious dramatists was even carried so far as to represent the solemn head of the Government being whirled about in a wild dance of French origin by scantily clothed fairies. The Ministers who thus invade cloudland in order to bestow on the fairies the blessings of the British Constitution at once set to work to establish a Government party and an Opposition, and to erect a Cabinet by competitive examination, places being assigned to the candidates who prove most conclusively their ignorance of the functions they undertake to discharge. One who innocently asks "What is a ship?" finds herself immediately installed at the Admiralty; another is appointed to be the guardian of art, as a reward for her arrogant and overbearing Philistinism. The result is of course that the peace of the aerial kingdom is soon at an end, everything is thrown into confusion, agitators brawl in the public ways, mutinous meetings are held, the mob obey only such laws as they please, and, while parsimony enfeebles the administration and defences of the country, the notorious pusillanimity of the Government provokes contempt and aggression. All this does not strike one as a very cutting or forcible satire. It is only a reproduction on the stage of what is said every day in some of the papers. Nor is it easy to assign a logical reason why a public man may be caricatured in *Punch* but not in a play. It would appear that in the first instance the LORD CHAMBERLAIN, when the manuscript of the piece was submitted to him, saw nothing in it to object to, for he sanctioned its performance; but it is probable that the copy on which he formed this judgment did not include the whole of the stage directions, especially as to costume, and speeches which may have seemed inoffensive enough in themselves would assume another complexion when it was known that they were delivered by actors disguised as members of the Government. After three or four performances the play was suddenly interdicted, and a lively discussion may be expected as to the authority of the LORD CHAMBERLAIN and the right of Mr. GLADSTONE to interfere with the amusements of his own flesh and blood.

In this case the LORD CHAMBERLAIN has certainly precedents to appeal to. Indeed the Act under which he exercises his authority was passed expressly with a view to prevent attacks on public men in the guise of comedy. Political allusions had been discovered in the *Beggar's Opera*, and FIELDING had even undertaken to bring Sir ROBERT WALPOLE and his colleagues personally on the stage. Some years ago Mr. SHIRLEY BROOKS was refused permission to dramatise *Coningsby*, and Mr. BUCKSTONE was forbidden to personate Lord JOHN RUSSELL, though the elder MATHEWS was allowed to imitate O'CONNELL. In one instance a play was sanctioned at the Coburg Theatre soon after GEORGE III.'s death, in which the old KING was represented as being borne up to heaven, while Queen CHARLOTTE, the PRINCE of WALES, SHERIDAN, FOX, and others figured in the course of the piece. This, however, must be regarded as one of those exceptions which prove the rule, and it may be assumed that no such piece would now be tolerated. Although the censorship has always been hostile to political satire on the stage, there is no reason to suppose that in this country the public has ever had much taste for anything of the kind. The difficulty in France and some other countries is to prevent audiences in times of excitement from attaching a political meaning to incidents and characters of a purely social kind, and more than one revolution has been associated with a dramatic success of this nature. Everybody knows the history of the *Marriage of Figaro* and what came of it. *Robert Macaire* lent an impulse to the spirit of contempt which overthrew LOUIS-PHILIPPE; and it is believed that the *Grand Duchess of Gerolstein* helped to drive Queen ISABELLA from the throne. It would be absurd, of course, to anticipate any such



consequences in our own country. It is conceivable that on the eve or in the midst of a general election, when any exciting question was under discussion, and party feeling ran high, appeals to public passions from the stage might not be without their effect; but they could hardly add much to the influence which is already exercised by the press. A Government strong in itself and in its policy has little to fear from lampoons or caricatures, whether printed or acted, and the weapons which are used by one side are open to the other. It is possible, however, that Mr. GLADSTONE does not number among his followers many who are adepts in this kind of warfare, and that his opponents would have the best, if not of the argument, at least of the jokes. The burlesque at the Court Theatre having been allowed to be produced, it may be doubted whether it was wise or prudent to come down upon it with a summary interdict, the result of which will certainly be to magnify the importance of a mere trifle of the hour, and to excite an amount of public curiosity which may possibly find some other means of gratifying itself. The *Happy Land* may still be performed at any theatre out of London, and even in London it is doubtful whether it might not be played at the music-halls with some slight modifications. On grounds of good taste we are disposed to think that such pieces are objectionable, but the enforcement of good taste in a democratic community by the exercise of the authority of the Government requires to be managed with a cautious and delicate hand.

#### CULPABLE LUXURY.

MR. W. R. GREG writes an article in this month's *Contemporary Review* in continuation of the controversy about the nobleman said by Mr. Goldwin Smith to consume the income of six hundred poor families. In his present remarks Mr. Greg passes with very little notice over the more technical part of the argument as to the truth of Mr. Mill's theorem that demand for commodities is not demand for labour. We shall follow his example, merely making one remark by way of explanation. Mr. Greg said in his last letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette* that we had interpreted a single ambiguous phrase used by him into a contradiction of the theorem in question. Our interpretation did not rest on any single passage, but on the whole line of argument adopted; and, if it were worth while continuing so technical a discussion, we should have to point out that the same error is involved in at least one sentence of the present article. The nobleman, says Mr. Greg, who lives in the height of luxury is to be "quietly conscious" that his expenditure enables "scores of families" to subsist in comfort. His expenditure, so far as it is an expenditure on luxury, does not enable a single family beyond his own to subsist at all; but we will not go again into a question on which we have already said enough, and which besides is fully discussed in all treatises on political economy.

We will come to a question of great importance now raised by Mr. Greg. He attacks Mr. Goldwin Smith by a retort. If the nobleman, he says, with 30,000*l.* a year is consuming the income of six hundred families, the gentleman with 3,000*l.* a year is consuming the income of sixty, and even the tradesman with 300*l.* a year the income of six families. Nay, the poor man who lights his pipe or drinks his dram is doing the same in a smaller degree. This, of course, is true; but it is very far from settling the question. It is obviously possible to maintain that a man is justified in consuming the income of sixty poor families, but not justified in consuming the income of six hundred. Indeed the doctrine is not only possible but plausible, and to some extent, we think, true. Our duty to our neighbour has its limits. Nobody would blame a man for attending to his own comforts rather than to his neighbour's up to a certain point, which it is of course impossible to define accurately. Nobody, that is, is a fitting object of disapproval because he does not carry his liberality to the extent of spending his whole income in promoting the welfare of others. But as his income increases, the objection to spending it all on his own enjoyment increases rapidly, and for a very obvious reason. An expenditure, we will say, of ten pounds on the private pleasures of a man who already spends 1,000*l.* a year adds far less to his comfort than an equal expenditure by a man who only spends 100*l.* a year. As a poor man grows rich, he can employ successive increments of income, first, on securing advantages which are almost necessities—on objects, that is, which directly contribute to his health and strength; secondly, on objects which may partly be called luxuries, but which still add very materially to his happiness; and, finally, when he becomes very rich, he finds very great difficulty in spending it on himself at all. A man, though ten times a millionaire, has only a limited number of faculties to gratify. When he has secured good air, good food, and good clothing and lodging—when he has bought as many books as he can read, as many horses as he can ride, and as many houses as he can inhabit—when he has obtained full means of satisfying every want to which he is sensible, it becomes exceedingly difficult to spend money in any way calculated to give himself pleasure. Hence it is plain that it may really involve less sacrifice for a man of 100,000*l.* a year to give away half his income than for a

man of 1,000*l.* a year to give away a tenth. The first is only depriving himself of means which by no possible exercise of ingenuity can be made to contribute very decidedly to his comfort. The other is compelled to pare off many luxuries the absence of which he would feel most sensibly. It is a difficult problem, on which we have sometimes reflected, how large an income a reasonable man should wish to possess—assuming, of course, that he spends it on himself. Beyond a certain point an increase of wealth is a burden instead of a pleasure; and a man becomes a slave to his own magnificence. And hence it is obvious that Mr. Greg's dilemma is merely verbal. If we do not bid a man of 3,000*l.* a year to give away as large a proportion of his income as a man of 30,000*l.* a year, it is simply because the sacrifice in the first case would be enormously greater than the sacrifice in the second. A peasant who cultivates a few flowers is as objectionable, says Mr. Greg, as a nobleman who keeps the biggest of parks and gardens, because his objection to the last is "evidently based on the assumption that all land ought to be devoted to growing food, at least till every one has food enough." We certainly do not make that assumption; but there is clearly a great moral difference between a man who cheers his dismal life by half-a-dozen dahlias and a nobleman who keeps up vast gardens through which he has hardly time even to walk. Both, it may be, sacrifice their neighbours to themselves; the man who might add a few potatoes to the dinner of a pauper, and the man who might give allotments to a parish. But one only sacrifices his neighbour in a degree which is necessary if we do not insist on everybody coming up to the ideal standard of the purest saint; and the other may be sacrificing the comfort of a district for a pleasure which occupies a scarcely perceptible corner of his time. There is a real difference between a labourer who takes the biggest slice of meat for himself and the man who puts everybody else on bread and water that he may drink champagne. From this point of view there would be nothing absurd—though of course there are abundant reasons against it of a different kind—in fixing a limit to the income which anybody might enjoy. It would be an intelligible proposition that, after a man has spent, say, 10,000*l.* a year on himself, every subsequent addition of income adds so incomparably less to his comfort than it would to the comfort of his neighbours, that he ought to give it away.

We do not, of course, hold this doctrine, any more than we hold any other form of communism. Amongst many conclusive reasons, there is the ordinary objection to gratuitous charity. To say that a man ought to give away large sums of money is generally to say that he ought to demoralize a district; but besides this, there is the strongest objection to making any such matter a question either of law or of strict morality. For reasons which we certainly need not discuss, we fully agree to the importance of preserving a strong sense of the sacredness of private property; and we should therefore think it preposterous to the last degree either to make a law regulating the amount of income which a man may enjoy, or even to fix a rigid moral standard prescribing the proper amount of charity. A man who spends his money in a manner not demoralizing to his neighbours should be exempt from any distinct censure, because otherwise we begin to infringe upon his private rights. In fact, it would be necessary, in order to lay down any definite principle, to decide in what degree a man may prefer his own interests to his neighbours; and we know of no method of calculating that delicate problem. All this, however, is merely saying that the duty incumbent upon a rich man is one of imperfect obligation. He ought to be liberal and generous, but the very essence of generosity is destroyed when you lay down the precise amount of generosity which is to be exacted under penalty of disapproval.

Indefinite, however, as the duty may be, and ought to be, it is not the less binding. We cannot say, you must give away so much according to an accurate sliding-scale, which increases in a greater ratio than the increase of your income; but we may fairly say, every man is under greater obligations to be liberal in proportion as he grows richer, because the sacrifice demanded from him becomes smaller. In fact, this is simply the true conservative doctrine. The formula adopted by Mr. Goldwin Smith has a rather invidious sound, but it contains an element of truth which we should think that Mr. Greg would not deny. Yet, implicitly, he seems to give some countenance to a dangerous doctrine. He says that a nobleman ought to have a quiet conscience when he has spent everything upon himself. He is enabling a number of families to subsist in comfort, and has thus done a great deal of good to others, whilst simply attending to his own interest. No one, whether nobleman or shopkeeper, ought to lay such a flattering unction to his soul. Suppose, in fact, that all English nobles or American millionaires acted on Mr. Greg's principles; that they considered that they had discharged the whole duty of man when they had bought pictures, built houses, preserved game, and attended horse-races. Is it not plain, without much argument, that we should be on the high road to a revolution, were it not that a very large number of noblemen take a very much higher view of their duty? Fortunately for the class and for the country, such men think that they are bound to employ their great revenues and vast influence for rather nobler purposes—for promoting education, building churches, improving labourers' cottages, or encouraging schemes of public interest. Great wealth raises a man above the necessity of contributing by direct personal labour to the satisfactory working of the machinery by which the business of the country is carried on; but it therefore brings with it the duty of devoting

part, though an indefinite part, of his wealth and influence to the public good. Giving away money in direct charity is, of course, the least desirable mode of expenditure; but there are other alternatives between spending it all on yourself and giving it away to beggars. The case is, of course, just the same in America. A rich man who founds a University, like Mr. Cornell, has behaved in a way which deserves the very highest praise. It would be absurd to say that everybody who is equally rich is bound to found Universities or analogous institutions; but we may safely say that the social condition of America will be healthy in proportion to the number of men who approximate to Mr. Cornell's standard, and unhealthy in proportion to the number who think that they have done their duty when they have built fine houses in New York and filled them with every refinement of luxury. The question whether gross corruption is to become the ruling power in the States or a sound public spirit to be generated in its place depends in no small degree upon whether rich men do or do not take a loftier view of their duty than Mr. Greg would exact. How to spend large sums of money for public purposes without doing more harm than good is indeed a very difficult problem; but it is not insoluble, and it is of vital importance to the welfare of society that a satisfactory solution should be obtained. That, again, can only be done if rich men are compelled to study the question by a strong sense of duty.

Other classes, Mr. Greg will say, have the same or correlative duties. Undoubtedly this is true and most important. The citizen's duty, for example, is to do his work in the most thorough and conscientious manner; and it is a duty which he is at least as much inclined to forget as the rich man to forget the duties of his station. But that is the very point. Mr. Greg very properly says that an increase of wages is of little use if the labourer drinks the balance which remains to him. But if a rich man is told that he may fairly spend all his money on himself, the poor man will of course learn the same lesson, if indeed he has not learnt it already. You are perfectly right, says Mr. Greg, to the millionaire, if you spend your whole income on fine houses and pictures. Very well, replies the poor man, then I am quite right if I spend my whole income on gin and tobacco. If the rich man's luxury is venial, why not the poor man's? Mr. Greg seems to say that both are right. We should assert that they are both wrong. The poor man ought to spend his money in the way most likely to conduce to his own welfare and that of the public. As a general rule, that will be by getting his own family decently fed, clothed, and housed, and by having his children sent to good schools. The rich man is bound, we will say, to discharge the same duty. Before he attends to anything else let him see that his family are fitted in every respect to take their stations as thoroughly cultivated members of society, and let him think more of himself and them than of any other human beings. But when he has done all this and spent a few thousands a year in the process, what is he to do with the surplus? Is he to go on perfectly content so long as he can devise new pleasures by taxing his ingenuity to the utmost? Surely it is plain that he has another duty, which hardly exists at all, or only in a most rudimentary state, for his poorer neighbour. He has the means of exerting an enormous influence for good or for evil upon society at large, and especially upon his immediate surroundings. We do not prescribe, and we agree that it is impossible to prescribe, how much influence he should exert or in what ways. But we may safely say that he is bound to take a large and generous view of his position. If he comes to the conclusion that the highest duty of a rich man is to shoot birds, he ought not to be legally punished; but he is certainly encouraging some of the worst evils which threaten society. If he thinks that he should use his superfluous means towards promoting the civilization of the masses, he may be doing much to provide a final remedy for social ills, and it is absurd to say that no duty is incumbent upon him under the circumstances. We do not say that a different code of morality should be enacted for the rich and the poor, but we do assert that the same code prescribes very different lines of action to the man who can gratify all ordinary wants, and still possess a great surplus of pecuniary power, and to the man who can at most provide himself with necessities, and with just enough luxuries to raise him from the barbarous stage to be more or less of an intellectual being. Luxury, in short, is permissible so long as it tends to elevate a man by awakening the perceptions which are necessarily deadened under the pressure of a hard struggle for existence. It becomes questionable when it means weakening the moral fibre by a painful search after new pleasures. That perhaps is the nearest approach to a test of the degree in which purely personal expenditure is desirable. The real justification of all expenditure on private pleasures is the absolute necessity of keeping up a class with leisure for thorough intellectual cultivation, if we are not all to sink to the level of mere eating and drinking animals. Thus a man who spends money on himself is really contributing essentially to the welfare of society. But the highest standard of culture is reached long before the highest standard of wealth. A man with ten thousand a year is at least as highly cultivated on an average as the man with fifty thousand; and therefore the justification of profuse personal expenditure diminishes rapidly as wealth increases beyond a certain level. And hence it is no paradox to say that you may consume the income of sixty, but that you ought not to consume the income of six hundred, families. In one case the expenditure produces a sufficient return

in the shape of a thoroughly trained and intelligent family, which is an important factor in the national life; in the other a much greater expenditure produces no more. A man may be justified in spending the income of six families to procure a University education for his son; but not in order to shoot a few more pheasants.

#### SILCHESTER.

THE Britain which our forefathers turned into England has, for the most part, to be looked for below the ground. That so it should be was one of the necessary results of the means by which that great change was made. At first sight it might seem as if the phenomena of our own country in this respect differed but little from the phenomena of other countries. Take for example the city which, of all the cities of Northern Europe, is richest in vestiges of Roman dominion. Rich as Trier still is in its remains above ground, its amphitheatre, its basilica, its palace, and the mighty pile of its *Porta Nigra*, there can be no doubt that far more extensive remains of Augusta Trevirorum lurk below. The vaults, the pavements, which are hidden under the mediæval and modern houses must be endless. But this is what always happens in a town which has never ceased to be inhabited. Nothing is so lasting as a street; nothing is so little lasting as the particular houses of which the street is made up. In Exeter, for instance, one of the few towns in England which have been continuously inhabited since Roman days, there are few houses even of mediæval date, but the main lines of the Roman city are there as plain as ever. Not a fragment, to the best of our knowledge, of the Damnonian Isca is standing above ground, but we should be surprised if there is not a good deal of it to be still found underneath. In cases like these the city is destroyed by the fact of its being preserved. It perishes piecemeal, because there was no moment when it was utterly swept away. Now on the Continent, as a rule, the Roman cities have been continuously inhabited down to our own time; in Italy, Gaul, and Spain the Roman life has never wholly died out. If therefore the Roman remains in those countries are on the whole much more scanty than we should have looked for, it is chiefly because they have perished through the wear and tear of ages; mediæval buildings gradually supplanted those of Roman date, as modern buildings are gradually supplanting those of mediæval date. The exceptions are to be found in those parts of the Continent where the circumstances were nearly the same as in our own island, in those border lands of Germany, Gaul, and Italy where the Teutonic conquest or reconquest trod out the remains of Roman life almost as thoroughly as it did in Britain. But, comparing the Continent in general with our own island, especially comparing that land of Gaul which it is most natural to compare with our own island, we find one main distinction to be, that in Gaul, as a rule, the Roman towns have been continuously inhabited, while in Britain, as a rule, they have not. We cannot in every place pronounce dogmatically. We know that Exeter, as not having been conquered by the English till after their conversion, has never ceased to be inhabited. But we know also that Chester, Bath, and Cambridge stood desolate for several centuries, and we know that Anderida has stood desolate till our own time. On the other hand, if Canterbury, York, London, and Lincoln ever stood desolate, the time of their desolation could not have been very long. But the point is that, in marked contrast to the Continental rule, a great number of the Roman cities of Britain were utterly wasted, and that many of them have never been rebuilt. Parts of some sites have been occupied by small villages; other sites stand altogether waste; of some Roman settlements it is even hard to find the site at all. The cases where a Roman town still exists as a considerable English town can hardly be the majority. Those which can be shown to have been uninterruptedly inhabited are a very small minority indeed. In France and Aquitaine, on the other hand, in utter contrast to Britain, the chief Roman towns still remain the chief towns in our own day. In Aquitaine and Provence they even commonly retain their names of Roman or earlier date, not forgetting that the still surviving names of Massalia and Antipolis carry us back to a state of things to which Britain has no parallel at all.

Now this utter destruction of the Roman cities, the desolation of so many of their sites down to our own day, is the most speaking witness of the wasting and exterminating character of the English Conquest. The fact that we know so little about it, the yawning gap between Roman and English history in Britain, a gap which has no parallel in Continental lands, teaches us better than anything else what was the real nature of the settlement made by our forefathers. It is a striking fact that no ornamental Roman building is to be found standing up in Britain. Not a single Roman column remains in its place throughout the whole land. This is not the mere work of time. To say nothing of Egyptian remains, Greece, Italy, and Sicily still keep abundant remains of Hellenic antiquity; it is owing to a mere accident of modern warfare that the Parthenon itself does not remain as perfect as when the Slayer of the Bulgarians paid his thanksgiving within its walls. It is because Britain was overrun by an enemy far more destructive than the Goth, the Frank, or the Turk himself. It is a speaking fact that of what must have been one of the greatest Roman cities of Britain we have absolutely no history whatever. Antiquaries are, we believe, now pretty well agreed that Silchester is the Roman *Calleva Atrebatum*—in Gaul the place might have been called Arras and its district Artois—and it is so marked in



Dr. Guest's map. But this is merely a geographical and not an historical fact. Calleva is simply a name in the Itineraries; nothing that ever we heard of is recorded to have happened there. Nor do we add very much to our knowledge if we conceive Silchester to have been *Caer Segint* of the so-called *Nennius*; for this one fact, that the elder *Constantius* was buried somewhere in those parts, can hardly be true, seeing that he died at York. Of the origin of the city we have no account; nor have we, as we have in the case of *Anderida*, *Bath*, and other cities, any statement, or even any direct clue, as to the time of its destruction. That we know nothing of its origin is most likely owing to the fact that *Calleva* seems to have been more of a city and less of a fortress than most of the Roman settlements in Britain. Its polygonal form, which it shares with *Duroilipons* or *Godmanchester*, stands in marked contrast to the quadrangular form of the camp, and suggests that it arose out of an earlier British settlement rather than out of a purely military post. As to the time of its destruction, it is plain from the discovery of coins of *Honorius* and *Arcadius* that the site was occupied as long as the Roman occupation of Britain lasted. The general indications which have been followed by Dr. Guest in tracing out his maps lead us to set it down as having been in English occupation—and English occupation just then was the same thing as destruction—before the great check which the English arms received at the hand of *Arthur* in 520. The destroyers therefore were *Cerdic* and *Cynric*, but we have no such notice of its overthrow as we get in *Henry of Huntingdon*, and even in the *Chronicles*, of the overthrow of *Anderida* at the hands of *Ælle* and *Cissa*. The whole history of the site is shrouded in darkness, but it is darkness more instructive than any amount of light.

The place is easy of access, lying from three to four miles from the Mortimer Station of the branch of the Great Western Railway between Reading and Basingstoke. The French name of Mortimer, coming between the two Teutonic tribe names of the *Rædingas* and the *Basingas*, and being itself the point of starting for the old Roman city, gives us a lesson in British nomenclature. As usual, the Roman, the Englishman, and the Norman have all left their mark; the Briton alone is utterly wiped out. When we reach the spot, the first feeling is perhaps one of disappointment; the walls do not stand out in the same stately sort as the walls of *Anderida*, the walls which stood as they stand now when *William* landed beneath them. We doubt if there is any place in the whole circuit where the outer surface has not been thoroughly picked away. In a country where stone is precious, *Silchester* walls and *Reading Abbey* church have alike been found useful as quarries. The wall is there in its whole extent, save where the gates have utterly perished, whether as part of the special work of the first conquerors, or because they supplied a tempting store of good stones in after-times. The wall is there, but it is often sadly broken down; in some places it has to be traced. Nowhere is its Roman character so forced upon the eye as it is at *Anderida*, and in the smaller fragments at *York* and *Lincoln*. But, when we get within the enclosure, utterly unoccupied except by a small church and a single farmhouse in one corner, our feeling is that of amazement at its vast extent. A glance shows that it is far larger than *Anderida*, than *Deva*, than *Ipsa*, than the original military posts of *Lindum* and *Eboracum*. The two largest diameters of the irregular polygon are, one rather more and one rather less, than half a mile. And when we come to examine the treasures below ground which have been brought to light by the zealous care of Mr. Joyce, we find that *Silchester* is indeed one of the great spots of our island. The excavations have as yet been carried over only a small part of the enclosure, but the foundations of a vast number of public and private buildings have been brought to light. In some cases it is plain that changes took place while the city was still inhabited. An ingenious conjecture has found a name and a probable use for everything that has been brought to light. We cannot enter into all of these; but two buildings of extraordinary interest must be spoken of. The excavations of the Forum, which seems to be almost perfectly made out, have brought to light the unmistakable foundations of a gigantic basilica. The foundations of the two rows of columns are there, and here and there fragments of the columns themselves, with noble *Corinthian* capitals, have been brought to light. They doubtless supported entablatures; there is no reason to think that the great invention of *Spilato*, the germ of all later architecture, had been forestalled at *Calleva Atrebatum*. The internal arrangement of the basilica must have been awkward as compared with that of the ecclesiastical basilicas at *Ravenna* and elsewhere. In these the semicircle of the apse continues on either side the lines formed by the two ranges of columns. At *Silchester* it is otherwise. Here the semicircle is greater than a semicircle would be which continued the ranges of columns, so that the ends of the columns, the two ranges of which seem to an ecclesiastical eye to stand strangely near together, must have abutted upon the chord of the semicircle, so as to throw the two ends of the apse itself into obscurity. Any one who remembers *Torcello* or *Clasis* will feel how utterly the effect of the apse must have been ruined by such a ground plan. Still, though the perfection of the basilican arrangement was not reached all at once, yet the building of *Silchester* must at least have shown two noble ranges of columns; and it is something to trace, and that on our own soil, the gradual development of the type which is in truth the germ of all ecclesiastical architecture. In the visitors' book at *Silchester* we

marked the name of Mr. James Fergusson more than once. Is it possible that even his craze can make him believe that, in the island, almost even in the neighbourhood, where these noble colonnades have been reared, even a Celt could be so perverse as to go back and build the rude masses of *Stonehenge*?

Another most remarkable discovery is that of a round temple. Two circular foundations, one within the other, may be clearly seen. It did flash across our mind for a moment whether these could be the foundations of a Christian church, a British *St. Vital*; for it must not be forgotten that a city which formed a part of the Empire of *Honorius* could hardly have been without Christian buildings. The absence of the projecting sanctuary is not absolutely conclusive against the possibility of its Christian use; still it is perhaps safer to set it down as a pagan building. It must be remembered that, if it were Christian, the outer circle of foundation would be for a wall, and the inner one for columns; while in a pagan building it would be the other way.

But one relic has been found at *Silchester* the interest of which, in a certain point of view, is beyond all others. Among the ruins of one of the houses, which had plainly been destroyed by fire, stowed away, it would seem, with care in a secret place, was a legionary eagle, broken away from its stem. This fact would seem to show that the Britons who withstood *Cerdic* and *Cynric* still so far looked upon themselves as Romans as to bear the ensign of *Marius* in their wars, and still to look on it as a sacred thing, which they strove by every means to keep from falling into the hands of the invaders. Such a piece of detail as this brings before us at once the unbroken march of history and the strange ups and downs along which that march has to be traced. We are all used to pictures of the landing of *Cæsar*, with the eagle brandished before the eyes of the astonished Britons. We have never seen a picture of the Briton keeping the ensigns which had been handed on to him by the conqueror who was also his teacher, and hiding them out of the sight of the conqueror who must have been not his teacher but destroyer. Yet it is the latter scene which most concerns us. It is because *Silchester* and places like *Silchester* were left waste without inhabitants—because those who dwelled in them were cut off by the sword or driven to save their lives in remote corners of Britain, perhaps of Gaul—because for a hundred years the faith of Christ was wiped out before the faith of *Woden*—it is because of all this that Britain has not been as Gaul and Spain, but that we still keep the laws and the tongue which we brought from the mouths of the *Elbe* and the *Eider*. *Calleva* and its people were swept away that the *Rædingas* and the *Basingas* might grow up as purely English settlements on the conquered soil.

#### DEPUTATIONS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

THE unwearied energy displayed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in receiving all sorts of deputations is no doubt a gratifying proof of his Grace's restored health, but still it may not be wholly superfluous to suggest that a little more discrimination might with advantage be shown in making choice of the deputations to be received. It is not three months since we were led to comment on the visit of the Lord's Day Rest Association to Lambeth Palace, and on Monday last they again waited on the Archbishop, having in the meantime—to do them justice—abandoned some, if not all, of the strange proposals to which he was then induced to accede. Whether the intended meeting at the Lambeth Baths ever came off we are not aware, but the notable plan of the Archbishop and the friends of the Society taking a Sunday walk along the New Cut and "improving the time by talk," as the hymn expresses it, has been definitively given up. Nor have we heard any more of the still more startling suggestion that a Sunday should be fixed early in the year—February 16 was the day named—for discharging a general broadside of Sabbatarian discourses from the pulpits of the Established Church and all the various denominations; this scheme, we may therefore hope, has been also abandoned, probably from the practical impossibility of carrying it out, to the considerable relief both of preachers and congregations. A subsequent proposal that the Bishop of London should make a journey to St. Paul's on foot in order to preach against Sunday cab-driving appears to have similarly collapsed. The remarks of the Archbishop on Monday last were temperate and sensible enough, and the effect of the Evening Hymn, sung by an assemblage of Lambeth tradesmen, led by Mrs. Tait and the Misses Tait, may be presumed to have been very impressive; though the closing remark attributed to his Grace, that "the noble old palace had never been put to so excellent a use before," will perhaps sound to those who are not members of the Sunday Rest Association just a little enthusiastic. It is, however, of another deputation which the Archbishop received on Tuesday last that we chiefly propose to speak here. The Sunday Rest Association has at least a laudable object, and if it is not conspicuous for the wisdom of the serpent, it may claim a large share of the innocence of the dove. But we are by no means prepared to bestow even the same qualified eulogy on the mysterious and anonymous Society which has been for the last thirty years and more sedulously employed in burrowing under the foundations of a great constitutional principle, affecting alike the social, the civil, and the religious interests of the nation. We have so frequently had occasion to expose the hollow professions, the slippery logic, and the reckless assertions of the advocates of what has been not inappropriately termed "the Bill

for abolishing Sisters-in-law," that it may seem almost a work of supererogation to waste any more words upon them. But there is a good deal of point in the advice of Giles Hogget to Mr. Crawley, "it's dogged as does it," and if dogged pertinacity in reiterating a thousand times what has been a thousand times refuted was ever calculated to produce an impression by mere force of perpetual repetition, it cannot be denied that the arguments for legalizing what are happily still regarded in this country as incestuous unions possess that element of success. Whether it is seemly or discreet for four thousand Dissenting ministers to constitute themselves the apostles of this most unsavoury crusade we shall not stay to inquire here. But it was, to say the least, very unfortunate that the Archbishop should have consented to receive a deputation from them, and we certainly incline to think that Lambeth Palace has seldom been put to a more incongruous use than on this occasion. Nonconformist ministers are of course at liberty to hold their own opinions on the subject, but an Archbishop of Canterbury might have been expected to remember that the table of forbidden degrees printed in every Prayer-Book includes the prohibitions which it was the object of these gentlemen to claim his assistance in removing. And even if he were disposed, as he does not avow, to agree with them in the abstract, and if there were—as there happily is not—the slightest reason for supposing that his support would carry Sir T. Chambers's Bill through the House of Lords, it would still not have been his business to come forward as the advocate of a measure which probably nine-tenths of the clergy and a clear majority of the laity of the Church over which he presides believe to be not only pregnant with the gravest social evils, but directly repugnant to the teachings of Scripture. On the latter point we shall not enter here. The objections to the Bill are overwhelmingly conclusive, quite apart from its religious demerits, and even if it could be shown to be, like polygamy, in entire accordance with the Jewish law, that would be no adequate justification for sanctioning either by the law of England. The reports which have appeared of the speeches of the Dissenting deputation at Lambeth on Tuesday are too brief to give anything but a very general idea of the kind of arguments employed. But the little that is told us is quite enough to show that the usual tactics of the party have not in this instance been forgotten. And, at the risk of repeating facts which to many of our readers must by this time have become wearisomely familiar, we shall once more expose the true nature of the reasoning to which the Archbishop promised to give his "most serious consideration," and which has induced him to take charge of the Dissenting ministers' petition to the House of Lords in favour of the Common Serjeant's Bill.

The principal members of the deputation were Dr. Binney, the Revs. W. Tyler and F. Schandhorst, who represented the Congregationalists; Dr. Vance Smith, from the Unitarians; the Revs. J. L. Witherington, J. Shrewsbury, and E. Workman representing different sections of the Wesleyans, and Mr. Heywood, who headed the deputation. The report of Mr. Heywood's speech is very short, but it embodies most of the leading fallacies which invariably crop out in the monotonous oratory of his associates. "He thought the House of Lords, with the increasing majorities with which the Bill was annually passed in the House of Commons, would ultimately give way to public opinion." To which it must be replied, that of the three assertions contained or implied in this statement every one is directly at issue with the facts. The Bill was neither passed nor introduced annually at all before 1869, and, with one exception, the divisions from 1869 to 1873 have exhibited a constantly decreasing majority in its favour in the House of Commons, though for the last three years a push has been made to smuggle it through the House at the very beginning of the Session before the Scotch and Irish members, who are known to be almost unanimously opposed to it, have come up to town. In 1869 the second reading passed by a majority of 99, but the Bill was withdrawn in Committee; in 1870 the majority had sunk to 70, and in 1871 to 41. Last year it rose to 48, and this year it has again fallen to 39. And, lastly, there is not only no ground for assuming that public opinion is in favour of the Bill, but there is the clearest evidence of this purely factitious agitation being kept up, as it was originally created, by the restless machinations of a small and wealthy clique, whose pretext of relieving the poor from a heavy burden is demonstrably a transparent disguise for their desire to cover by a retrospective Act their own deliberate breach of the existing law. The Commission of 1847, got up and conducted by friends of the proposed innovation, could only discover forty cases of such unions among the poor, while in two large London parishes the most careful scrutiny only detected two. Nor is Mr. Heywood more happy in his implied reproach of the House of Lords for systematically opposing itself in this matter to the verdict of the House of Commons. This is again a favourite topic with the agitators, and at the Indignation Meeting held in February 1871 at St. James's Hall, under Mr. Chambers's auspices, it was proposed by the chairman to facilitate the passing of the measure by ejecting the bishops from the Upper House, while Mr. Odger more consistently advocated its total abolition. What are the facts? The Bill made its first appearance in Parliament in 1842, when leave to bring it in was refused by a majority of 23. On its next appearance in 1849, the second reading passed the Commons by a majority of 34, but the Bill fell through in Committee. The same fate overtook it in 1855, after it had been carried by a majority of 7 only; but it had meanwhile passed the Commons in 1850 by a

majority of 52, and then for the first time made its way into the Upper House, where it was withdrawn without coming to a division. In 1858 it passed by a majority of 42, and in 1859 by 58, and was thrown out on both occasions by the Lords. Between that time and its next appearance in the Upper House in 1870, it had been five times thrown out in the House of Commons. Its subsequent history has been already told. The net result, therefore, is this—that three times the Bill has passed the second reading in the House of Commons, and foundered in Committee; five times it has been thrown out, without reckoning its summary extinction in 1842; once it has been sent up to the Lords and withdrawn without a division, and five times the Lords have rejected it. It has also twice been introduced in the Upper House, in 1851 and 1856, and thrown out. This is a very different state of things from what Mr. Heywood's language indicates.

The remaining speeches are less important. Dr. Binney appears to have chiefly occupied himself with the Scriptural aspects of the question, but he also urged that great social evils had resulted from the operation of the present law; and Dr. Vance Smith, who followed him, gave an instance of what is meant by this complaint. He knew of "a man who had left his property to the sister of his deceased wife, and was living in a constant state of alarm lest the authorities should discover the illegality of the marriage, and claim the extra succession duty." If we are to understand that the man had married his deceased wife's sister—and the reference would also be irrelevant—and wished her to inherit as his wife, the authorities would of course be fully justified in law and equity in claiming the full succession duty; in fact, this is simply one of the usual examples of a change in the law being demanded in order to shelter those who have first deliberately broken it from the consequences of gratifying their irregular appetites. Even if the proposed measure were a desirable one, it ought not in common decency to be made retrospective. Dr. Binney also expressed an opinion, the grounds of which we should be curious to learn, that the Scotch laity are almost unanimously in favour of these marriages. Mr. Buckle, it is true, calls Scotland one of the most priest-ridden countries in the world; but until Dr. Binney produces some better evidence than his own *ipse dixit*, we must venture to think his statement hardly consistent with the fact that the Scotch members are almost unanimously opposed to the Bill. The remark of another speaker that the great majority of Roman Catholics are in favour of the Bill is, we believe, equally incorrect. Mr. Maguire stated in the debate last year that in Ireland it was viewed "with loathing and execration." Dr. Cullen is said to be in favour of it, but certainly with no intention of allowing it to be generally acted upon within the limits of his jurisdiction; and Cardinal Wiseman stated before the Parliamentary Committee, what is notorious, that such marriages are allowed with dispensations in the Roman Catholic Church. We believe we are right in saying that such dispensations are restricted to those who can afford to pay for them, and it is certainly true that they are also given, in Catholic countries, for the marriages of uncles and nieces, or aunts and nephews. In Germany, Holland, Austria, Italy, Spain, France, and Denmark, all these unions are allowed by the law, in some cases with, in some without, dispensation. And it is obvious on the face of it that, if once the general prohibition of marriages of affinity is relaxed, it will be neither consistent nor practicable to draw the line at one particular example of the rule. If a man may lawfully marry his wife's sister, it is absurd to forbid his marrying her mother or her niece, and equally absurd to forbid his marrying his deceased brother's wife. Whether the advocates of the one change profess to defend or deprecate its logical consequences matters very little. The present law is based on a consistent and intelligible principle, and is so far from pressing hardly, except on a small clique of eccentric and unscrupulous malcontents, that its abolition would be felt as an intolerable hardship by the great majority of the nation. Not many years ago an English Protestant lady residing at Rome in charge of the children of her deceased sister, who had married an Italian count, was surprised to find herself the subject of unpleasant comment. On applying to her brother-in-law's confessor, she was at once assured that, unless she intended to marry him, she could not with propriety continue to live under his roof. Yet in Italy such marriages require a dispensation; if once the law is altered, there would be no such check, whatever it may be worth, in England. One further remark naturally suggests itself. It was only the other day we were criticizing a new variation of murder, which its admirers propose to legalize under the pretty sobriquet of "euthanasia." If Mr. Tollemache and the Common Serjeant can get their respective proposals sanctioned—perhaps the former, too, may some day invoke archiepiscopal patronage—there will be a fine field open to enterprising ladies who combine an erratic passion for their brothers-in-law with Christine Edmunds's graceful facility in effecting a happy despatch.

It was urged on the Archbishop by some members of the deputation on Tuesday that, as the proposed marriages were not meant to be solemnized in church, no conscientious scruples of the clergy would be violated. This is a subordinate point, though it was natural under the circumstances to refer to it; but the clergy may not improbably consider the proffered concession an inadequate protection to their consciences if they are compelled, for instance, to treat persons married to their relations at a registrar's office as having a claim on their ministrations afterwards. We merely note the matter here as another example of the off hand fashion of dealing with objections



to their darling crotchet which characterizes the supporters of this ill-omened scheme. When the Common Serjeant introduced his Bill last year, he observed that argument on the subject was exhausted, and we quite agree with him. But as long as the barefaced audacity of assertion which distinguishes him and his friends in their pertinacious efforts to unsettle both the legal and the moral safeguards of domestic peace and purity continues to be inexhaustible, it is necessary to expose, for the hundred and first time, the stale sophistries which a hundred previous exposures have not yet shamed into silence.

#### THE FORGED BILLS.

THE announcement which was made on Monday morning that forged bills to the value of some 100,000*l.* had been discounted by the Bank of England produced, for a short time, something like a panic in the City. Nobody of course supposed that the loss would make much difference to the Bank, but it was felt that a serious blow had been struck at the foundations of commercial confidence and security. That a fraud of such a daring and elaborate character should have been practised on the most careful and cautious of financial bodies naturally excited suspicion and alarm. If the Bank of England could be bitten in this way, who was safe? The Bank, as everybody knows, will have nothing to do with doubtful people, or with rash, speculative transactions; it does only the safest of safe business, and only the most respectable paper has any chance of being looked at in the sacred parlour. A customer must bring good recommendations, must be personally vouched for by a Director or customer, and must prove his substantiality and credit in a variety of ways. If, in spite of all this, bad paper had been passed at the Bank, it was not perhaps an unreasonable apprehension that the rogues who had tricked so wary and circumspect an institution had probably not been idle in other quarters where they would find greater eagerness to do business, and fewer troublesome formalities to be overcome. The result was that for some time almost all bills were suspected. The better the names the more chance of mischief—so men reasoned; for only good names are worth forging, and with the *Post Office Directory* to choose from at pleasure, a forger might be trusted to pick the best. The disappearance of Mr. de Lizardi helped to add to the general uneasiness. Forged bills here, fraudulent bills of lading there, Glyn's swindled one day, the Bank the next—here was indeed enough to shake the nerves of men to whom paper is everything, who buy, sell, and trade in paper, and who, once flustered by suspicion, see fraud and forgery on every side. Commerce has come to be a vast system of credit, a paper world, and a suspicion of extensive forgeries is worse than an earthquake. Happily the fit did not last very long; but it may be taken as an illustration of the extremely delicate and sensitive organization of mercantile affairs.

Enough is known of the forgeries of which the Bank of England has been made the victim to show that they were planned and executed in the most deliberate and systematic manner, with great daring, ingenuity, and skill, and with a command of financial and other resources which is certainly the most startling circumstance in the whole affair. That a needy scoundrel should exercise his wits—his sole possession—in forgery would not excite much surprise, but men of substance are seldom disposed to stake their capital on the success of a felony. It is quite clear, however, that in this case those who devised and concocted the forgeries must have possessed, not only a thorough and minute acquaintance with mercantile ways and all the details of business, but also the command of a considerable amount of ready money. How many were involved in the crime has yet to be discovered, but it is suspected that there must have been a number of conspirators at work. It may prove, however, that Warren, who negotiated the bills, was the chief, if not the sole, agent in the affair, and that his clerk, who is now in custody, was only his tool. The perils of forgery are necessarily multiplied by the number of confederates, and the actual work to be done might easily be accomplished by one skillful and industrious expert. Warren, an American, who gave himself out as an agent for providing Pullman's sleeping-cars to run between Paris and Vienna while the Exhibition in the latter capital was open, contrived to get an introduction to the West End branch of the Bank of England in Burlington Gardens. He was introduced by an old customer of the Bank, deposited a satisfactory balance, and took care to renew it from time to time. Warren's dealings with the Bank began as far back as last May, and he took every opportunity of establishing himself in the confidence of the officials. He occasionally brought bills on Rothschild's and other houses which were undoubtedly genuine, and he was very punctual and regular in all his transactions. He showed that he had not only plenty of ready money, but intimate relations with good people in the City; and when the time came for the production of the forged bills, the manager of the Bank was probably prepared to accept them without the slightest hesitation. There was nothing in the appearance of the documents to create suspicion. They had been manufactured so skillfully as to defy the most jealous and suspicious scrutiny. It is well known that different firms use different forms of acceptance, partly written and partly printed on peculiar kinds of paper, with distinctive water-marks. Blank forms suitable for each case had therefore either to be stolen or imitated, and then they had to be filled up

with a great variety of signatures. Bills drawn upon a dozen different houses in the City were counterfeited in this way so closely and cleverly that, even now that they are known to be forgeries, it is said to be difficult to believe it. The first of these false bills does not fall due till the 25th of this month, and Warren no doubt calculated upon turning the interval to profitable account in a similar way. It does not appear that he passed off any forgeries except at Burlington Gardens, but this was probably because he thought he had plenty of time before the inevitable exposure when the bills were presented for payment, and he did not want to press matters too much. His patience in waiting from May last before he began to cheat the Bank showed his preference for cautious and deliberate modes of action. A slight, but rather important, omission in two of his bills disclosed the plot. He forgot to date them; they had to be sent to the houses on which they were drawn in order to supply the omission, and they were of course at once repudiated.

It is quite possible that, as we have said, Warren may have been the sole agent in these daring and ingenious forgeries, but it can hardly be doubted that he had assistants, if not actual confederates, who were well acquainted with mercantile practices, and who provided him with specimens of the forms and signatures which it was necessary for his purpose to imitate. Forgeries are not so rare as is supposed, and of late years, with the spread of elementary education, they are said to have been rather increasing, but they are seldom attempted on a large scale or for great amounts. A clergyman at Middlesbrough is just now awaiting his trial for forging joint-stock scrip to the amount of some 20,000*l.* or 30,000*l.*, but the common run of forgeries seldom go beyond petty sums. For a parallel to the case which has just excited so much alarm and uneasiness we must go back some thirty years and more. In 1841 the *Times* brought to light a bold project of forgery, and its prompt and energetic action in the matter is commemorated by a tablet in the Royal Exchange. Four or five different persons, some in Florence others in London, were engaged in the conspiracy. On this occasion the forged papers were not bills, but letters of credit. The conspirators procured one of Messrs. Glyn's letters of credit, and produced an imitation of it so perfect that one of the partners of the house said that for a time he was unable to distinguish between the original and the copy. Two Scotchmen, father and son, resident in Florence, designed the facsimiles, and a couple of Frenchmen, one of them a marquis, took charge of the engraving of the plates in London. An English banker at Florence named Bogle superintended the distribution of the forgeries. They were presented for payment at Brussels, Ghent, Cologne, Turin, Bologna, and Florence in rapid succession, and in a few days 20,000*l.* had been obtained on them. Either seduced by their easy success, or afraid of prompt detection, and eager to make the most of their chances before an alarm was raised, the conspirators pressed the game too recklessly. Suspicion was aroused, and a communication was sent to Glyn's which led to a disclosure of the fraud. The *Times* was not afraid to publish an article showing up the swindle in all its ramifications, and Bogle, thinking he could brazen out the matter, took advantage of this to bring an action for libel. Owing to a technical rule of evidence which prevented the production of certain private letters, the jury were unable legally to identify the plaintiff with the conspiracy, but they gave him only a farthing damages. The *Times* refused to accept the subscription which was raised to defray its expenses at the trial, and the money was applied to the foundation of scholarships for the boys of Christ's Hospital and the City of London School, and to the erection of commemorative tablets.

If forgeries are not more common than they are, it is for other reasons than the difficulty of forging. The truth is, that forgery is a very simple art, and a natural aptitude for it may be quickly developed by a little practice. Almost any engraver's or lithographer's apprentice might readily become more or less expert in it; and, considering the vast amount of business which is daily transacted in London through the medium of hasty signatures, it is at first sight almost amazing that forgeries should not be more frequent. Perhaps the greatest check upon offences of this kind is that, although a man might thus win a considerable sum of money by a lucky *coup*, the art cannot be continuously exercised. The actual forgery may be easy enough, but the passing of the forgery is another matter. Except at the counter of a bank, where cheques are paid off hand, no business is transacted between absolute strangers, and even at the bank-counter the system of crossed cheques comes into play. Most men in the City either know, or know about, each other, and the great bulk of business is done through bankers, brokers, or other intermediaries, who may be taken as a sort of personal guarantee for the character of those for whom they act. In the present case Warren had to spend the best part of a year in building up a character which he must have been aware would be destroyed for ever as soon as his practices became known. The game may be played once, but only once; it requires both daring and adroitness; it is perilous; and, even if successful, it can scarcely be expected to yield anything but a small fraction of what might be earned by the continuous exercise of the same abilities in an honest way. It will be seen, therefore, that the chances of being imposed upon to a serious extent by forgeries are by no means so great as might be imagined. At the same time, it is a question whether so simple a precaution as communicating in the first instance with the persons whose names are attached to bills, when they exceed a certain amount, might not be adopted as a check upon fraud. With regard to bills of lading, the present system is almost a provocation to dishonesty, and

there could be no difficulty in providing that bills of lading, like bills of exchange, should be issued in sets of three only, and that they should be numbered, and also perhaps distinguished by the colour of the paper.

#### SOLDIERS AND THEIR POCKET-MONEY.

ALL classes of Her Majesty's respectable subjects are always doing their best to keep up appearances, and a very hard struggle many of us make of it. Thus a mansion in Belgrave Square ought to mean a corpulent hall-porter, a couple of gigantic footmen, a butler and an under-butler at the very least, if the owner professes to live up to his social dignities. If our house is in Baker or Wimpole Street, we must certainly have a manservant in sombre raiment to open our door, with a hobbledehoy or a buttons to run his superior's messages. In the smart, although somewhat dismal, small squares in South Kensington and the Western suburbs, the parlourmaid must wear the freshest of ribbons and trimmest of bows, and be resplendent in starch and clean coloured muslins. So it goes on, as we run down the gamut of the social scale; our ostentatious expenditure must be in harmony throughout with the stuccoed façade behind which we live, or the staff of domestics we parade. We are aware, of course, as our incomes for the most part are limited, and as we are all of us upon our mettle in the battle of life, that we must pinch somewhere if appearances are to be kept up. We do what we can in secret towards balancing the budget. We retrench on our charities, save on our coals, screw on our cabs, drink the sourest of Bordeaux instead of more generous vintages, dispense with the cream that makes tea palatable, and systematically sacrifice substantial comforts that we may swagger successfully in the face of a critical and carping society. But, with the most of us, if our position is an anxious one, it is of our own making, and if we dared to be eccentrically rational, it might be very tolerable.

There is one class of Her Majesty's subjects, however, and perhaps the most showy of all, of whom this can hardly be said. It is victimized not only by circumstances and by the more amiable weaknesses of our nature, but by illusions which our Government does its best to encourage. All members of the military caste are at a great disadvantage as compared with the rest of us, and the non-commissioned officers and privates suffer even more than their superiors. An officer who lives on his pay, or on his pay and some small supplement to it, has a hard time of it no doubt. He must deny himself much that he would delight to indulge in, and must be sorely pushed if he is to dispose economically and unprofitably of all his superfluous time. But at least he has not to live up to the showy livery which the State compels him to assume when on duty. He need only appear in his resplendent war-paint where every one knows precisely all about him and his circumstances. When he mixes in the promiscuous civilian crowd, he disguises himself in unobtrusive mufti, and becomes a commonplace-looking personage like ourselves. With the sergeant, corporal, or private, it is altogether different. When he leaves his barrack-yard in the blaze of scarlet and yellow—or blue with gorgeously gaudy facings—in phibeg and chequered hose and nodding ostrich plumes; perchance in helmet and horse-hair, white buckskin tights, and spurred jackboots—he feels that he becomes forthwith the cynosure of surrounding eyes. The homage and admiration he receives is enough to turn a stronger head or disturb a better balanced mind. Conceive the respect with which he is regarded by the ragged roughs leaning up against the street corners and lounging round the public-house doors. They are slow to realize the fact that the splendour which impresses them is but the garb of servitude—a very honourable servitude it is true—that by accepting the shilling and passing the surgical examination they might transform themselves from the grub to that full-blown butterfly. As they follow the hero form with eyes of respectful admiration, they straighten their slouching backs, and they add a cubit or so to their stunted stature if they can attain to the honour of a flying acquaintance. If it be so with the men, still more is it the case with the damsels of humble life. Venus has always had a tenderness for Mars, especially when Mars wears the laurelled helmet on his god-like brow and shakes his glittering spear. The ox-eyed maidens shoot their bewitching glances from behind a hundred area railings, and the young and sprightly warrior must be misanthropic or more than mortal if he does not assume in the circumstances the airs of a conquering hero. But it is all very well to button the tight-fitting tunic or shell jacket so as to set off the manly shape, to poise the cap jauntily on one side of the well greased locks, to burnish the war medal, and flourish the Lilliputian cane. Soldiers rising thirty have the tastes and passions of their age, and naturally feel that they are formed to shine in society and enjoy its pleasures. They feel a legitimate satisfaction in patronizing the *pékings* of their own sex, and would prefer to stand treat to them rather than to be treated; they would gladly be free-handed with those laughing ladies could they only afford it. Alas, with them more than with any one else, appearances are painfully deceptive. Those fine clothes of theirs might almost as well be made without pockets for anything in the way of money they have to carry on their persons. The old pecuniary chances of the soldier's calling are gone in these days of piping peace and rigid discipline. In the wars of the middle ages, and even in the campaigns of the last century, the profession had its money prizes and its times of enjoyment when it revelled

in free quarters. You won a battle, and, if you could catch a prisoner in easy circumstances, you were allowed to put him to ransom. You sacked a town, and, if you were in any kind of luck, you filled your havresac with plate, or jewels, or valuable portable property of some kind. But nowadays there are no such chances. Soldiers can seldom make prisoners when the opposing columns rarely come within a mile or so of each other. If they do, they must hand them over to their superiors. It is a point of honour to offer scrupulous protection to private property from individual pillage. Generals in command may levy contributions at discretion, but if the private follows the example of his chiefs, he is apt to be very summarily dealt with. So it comes to this, that he has to subsist on a fixed income, with the remote prospect of a pension. But the fixed income is so minute as to approach the infinitesimal, and, what is worse, the world is given to understand that he is infinitely better off than he really is.

Fancy being condemned to lead not only an idle but a fashionable life on a penny a day. It is to be hoped that things can never again be so bad as that, now that Mr. Cardwell has reformed the regulation pay in the soldier's favour; indeed they can hardly have been so bad since General Peel took the initiative in a liberal direction by granting the soldier the additional twopence. But until a very few years ago the stately trooper in a crack cavalry corps might find himself for weeks or months together stinted to a penny a day for all pocket-money, and a letter that appeared in the *Times* a few days ago asserts the thing to be still possible. No doubt the original bargain by which he hired his services to the Queen was conducted with all technical legality. Had he taken the trouble to consult the terms of the bond before subscribing to it, he might have found out that the soldier's "shilling a day" was a mere popular hallucination, and that the standing deductions cut it down woefully. But men like him are indifferent arithmeticians at best, and not much given to forethought, and the scapegrace who was most likely to volunteer for the service was recklessly impetuous, if not actually in drink. We may think that an honourable Government, in engaging an ignorant man, should have taken particular care to make all parts of the bargain plain, and to preclude all possibility of misapprehension. But we suspect that the arrangements with regard to pay were only part of our system of "volunteering" as opposed to the Continental conscription by which men must be obtained somehow. The soldier came to the paymaster for his shilling, and opened his eyes to find that there was a stoppage for his daily rations of meat and bread. Imagine a master deducting so many pence a day for the dinner of the footman who lives under his roof. Then came further claims for messing and for clothes. The recruit was not told plainly that the terms of his wage were a shilling a day, one-and-fourpence a day, or whatever it might be, and feed and clothe himself. The Horse Guards apparently did their very best to make a muddle of the contract; and while the Queen provided the cavalry man with tunic, smalls, and boots, he had not only to buy the rest of his clothing, but actually his uniform jacket as well. So it is still, though his pay is a little better. Periodically he may be in tolerably easy circumstances for a time; he may have the magnificent sum of sevenpence at his absolute disposal. Rich to that extent, he acquires extravagant habits, gets into expensive company, and his mode of living does no great discredit to his brilliant cloth. On a sudden evil times come upon him. The underclothing that has done duty for so long begins to tumble to pieces. His jacket turns dingy and gets worn at the seams, he becomes a disgrace to his corps, and the order issued to replace it. Then the best part of his sixpence a day vanishes, and he is left with a miserable copper or two rattling in his empty pockets.

We suspect that what with one thing, what with another, most of those sprightly, good-humoured fellows whom we meet swagging in uniform along the pavement are generally in this impecunious condition. We presume that it is a point of honour with them to carry their poverty off philosophically, as they would feel bound to grin over slight flesh wounds received on the day of battle. But a cheerful countenance must often cover an aching heart. Even out of the wretched sum that mocks their wishes there are certain necessities which must be provided. The Crown expects you to be clean and smart, but we do not understand that it furnishes either soap or pipeclay. Tobacco is never so indispensable as when a man's spirits are low, and you must mortify the flesh at every turn and renounce the vanities of happier days. We should fancy there is nothing the soldier dislikes so much as a long promenade without the means of refreshing himself. It must brighten a long walk to feel, as you pass before each successive public-house, that you have only to will to refresh yourself with a half-pint, or "try our celebrated cream of the valley." It gives the walk a zest and an object to know that the half-pint or the half-quarter surely awaits you at the end, if you have not chosen to indulge yourself sooner. We can conceive few things more melancholy, on the other hand, than mooning along in sullen despondency, knowing that you must return dry-lipped as you came out unless some good Samaritan should compassionate your case and make you an object of charity. The soldier wandering past bar after bar, where vociferous groups are clinking glasses and clattering pewter, reminds one of the spirit of some sinful Norse hero condemned to keep moving round the table of Valhalla while his phantom companions in arms are draining the spectral beakers of ale. Seriously, we say that the life of the soldier must necessarily be one of great



temptation, and when he is culpable, or even criminal, he may plead the peculiarities of his lot by way of extenuating circumstances. His early training has seldom been such as to lead him to beguile his leisure by self-education and intellectual recreation. He has a great deal of time on his hands, and very little money wherewith to kill it. No doubt his straitened circumstances are in a certain sense a moral safeguard; but then there is another aspect to the question. The soldier has tastes which he cannot possibly gratify, and no constant occupation to turn his thoughts from his longings. We know what the old poet sings about Satan and idle hands, and a smart man who falls into bad company must be perilously open to unscrupulous suggestions as to how he may find money or money's worth. In any case it must, to say the least, be relaxing to the moral fibre to be tempted to toady a man for the sake of being treated, and to make love in order that your mistress may share her wages with you. It would be both impossible and undesirable materially to increase the soldier's pocket-money, but certainly the men should have a fair chance, and should receive all reasonable assistance towards preserving their self-respect and independence. Mr. Cardwell's recent proposals are a step in the right direction, and no one should grudge the slight addition to the Estimates which they will involve. We only hope that, in benefiting the soldiers as a body, he will take care that no single class of them has reasonable cause of discontent.

#### HEIRS AND MONEY-LENDERS.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY has again brought forward his Bill for the protection of "infants" against the frauds and exactions of money-lenders, but it may be doubted whether infants are not already sufficiently protected under the tender guardianship of the Court of Chancery. It is proposed by the Bill that any person who makes or procures any advance to an infant, or accepts any bond, bill, note, cheque, or other security for securing the repayment of a loan from an infant, without the consent in writing of the infant's father or guardian, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be liable for each offence to a fine of not more than 20*l.*, or two months' imprisonment. It is to be a misdemeanour even to request or solicit an infant to borrow money, whether by verbal application, or by circular, card, or letter; and all contracts made or securities given in contravention of the Bill are to be void. An infant may make false statements about his age without fear of the consequences, for his representations on the subject are not to be admitted as evidence against him. An obvious objection to a measure of this kind is that it attempts too much. If it were to be made a criminal offence to lend money to an infant without the sanction of his father or guardian, and if the law were strictly enforced, it would simply have the effect of driving young men who wanted money for purposes which they were afraid or ashamed to disclose to their fathers or guardians into the hands of a lower and more reckless and unscrupulous class of money-lenders than those who now prey on them. The money-lender's risks would be greatly increased, and, as he is known not to be actuated by purely benevolent and philanthropic motives, it may be assumed that he would require to be paid for those additional risks, and would no doubt assess them at a somewhat higher figure. He would have to be paid for the risk of being deceived by the borrower pretending that he was of age when he was under age; for the risk of an infant turning against him; for the risk of being tried for a criminal offence and perhaps sent to prison. It shows a curious estimate of human nature to suppose that a fast infant would be able to procure the consent of his father or guardian to his borrowing money for the purposes of gambling and debauchery. On the other hand, it is idle to suppose that any amount of legislation will ever prevent profligate and extravagant young men from obtaining advances on the strength of their future prospects. The eagerness of young heirs to get money and the willingness of money-lenders to supply their necessities are tolerably certain in combination to strike out some means of evading the restraints of the law, and it may be taken for granted that whatever underhand and illegal arrangement is made is sure to be at the expense of the borrower. It must not be forgotten that there are money-lenders and money-lenders. Money-lending in the way we are now speaking of cannot of course under any circumstances be a nice business, and it is difficult to imagine a delicate or high-minded man engaging in it. Yet it can hardly be going too far to say that there are some money-lenders, even of the sort who minister to the wants of reckless youth, who are better than others. In every deep there is a lower depth, and on the whole, considering the hopelessness of keeping infants and money-lenders entirely apart, it may perhaps be the wisest policy not to hand over the business exclusively to the lowest kind of scoundrels. Draconic laws are apt to defeat this object, and Mr. Mitchell Henry's Bill would, we fear, in so far as it had any effect at all, be apt to do more mischief than good.

On the other hand, let us see what the Court of Chancery is already willing and able to do for young heirs who have been hard pressed by the usurers. The Lord Chancellor, in an elaborate judgment affirming the decision of Vice-Chancellor Wickens in the case of Lord Aylesford *v.* Morris, has just explained very fully the precepts of equity on this subject. Lord Aylesford, it will be remembered, borrowed nominally some 11,000*l.*, of which

he received only 7,000*l.*, at sixty per cent. Lord Selborne did not waste any needless sympathy or sentiment on the young heir in this case. Lord Aylesford had, he said, no merits of his own. He came into court to be relieved from the consequences of a course of wilful and culpable folly and extravagance. Against Morris, the defendant, there was nothing to be alleged except that he was a money-lender and partial to sixty per cent. He was not accused of having done anything in the way of deceit or circumvention, and in fact his conduct seems to have been perfectly open and straightforward. "I take sixty per cent.," he said, "because I get the best price I can; we all do that." There are one or two subordinate characters who may as well be introduced to complete the *dramatis personæ*. There was a solicitor named Graham, who had in the first instance lent his lordship money, but who was anxious to get his money back, and therefore introduced him to Morris. It was arranged that Morris should accept Lord Aylesford's bills to the amount of 8,000*l.* at sixty per cent. Of this sum Morris retained 1,200*l.* as discount, and 3,000*l.* was paid to Graham on account of his outstanding claims. These bills, which were negotiated when Lord Aylesford was just six months over age, came due three months afterwards, on the 4th of October, 1870. The young nobleman's share of the money was, no doubt, pretty well exhausted by this time, and he found himself, as might have been expected, unable to meet the bills. He consulted Curtis, an hotelkeeper, and Curtis was kind enough to introduce him to a professional friend of young gentlemen in distress, one Addison. Addison represents a familiar type. He had been an officer in the army, and he now appears as earning a livelihood as agent for money-lenders. There was another case not long ago in which a major figured as a provider of a similar stamp—not a lion's provider, but the jackal of a money-lender's den. Addison is described by the Lord Chancellor as "a procurer of loans for spendthrifts from money-lenders." His own account of himself, however, is that he is a "monetary agent," or "the intermediate person bringing the capitalist and borrower together," which is no doubt a prettier way of putting it. For this service he is paid by a brokerage on the amount of the bills, and not of the money lent—so that, as Lord Selborne observed, he has a direct interest in swelling the amount of the bills as much as possible. Well, Lord Aylesford puts himself unreservedly in Addison's hands. Addison scours the town, as he says, trying to do what he can for his client. He goes to one money-lender after another, but they all shake their heads. Somehow they do not like the look of the thing. As a last resource, Addison tries Morris, who holds the bills. Morris is indeed the real friend in need. He agrees to renew the bills for 8,000*l.* by substituting another set for 11,000*l.* at three months at sixty per cent. as before. By this transaction Addison found himself 275*l.* the richer, while Lord Aylesford, so that he might not feel altogether neglected, received 207*l.* It was urged on Morris's behalf that he was entitled to a good price for his accommodation, because other money-lenders had refused to take up the bills, and the transaction must therefore be supposed to have been not a very promising one for the lender; but the Lord Chancellor suggested that perhaps the money-lenders who would have nothing to do with Lord Aylesford had some inkling of the functions of the Court of Chancery, and did not care to come into collision with it. Thus we find that a nobleman, just of age, and acting without the benefit of any competent and disinterested adviser, had, on receipt of 7007*l.*, put his name to bills for 11,000*l.* at sixty per cent. These bills fell due in three months, and they would then have had to be renewed on equally, or probably still more, onerous terms if Lord Aylesford's father had not died in the interval. Under these circumstances the Lord Chancellor, agreeing with Vice-Chancellor Wickens, held that there was an onus on the money-lenders to show that the terms which he exacted were fair and reasonable, and that, as he had failed to prove this, he must be content with five instead of sixty per cent. If Mr. Mitchell Henry's Bill had been law, it would have been of no service to the plaintiff in this case, as he was already of age; but the Court of Chancery would not allow a few months to make such a difference, and regarded him as still practically a minor and entitled to its protection.

It may perhaps be thought that Lord Selborne's judgment meets what may be considered the natural justice of the case. There is no need to waste any sympathy on the young man whose reckless folly and extravagance involved him in this scrape; and, on the other hand, it may be said that there is no reason to regret that money-lenders should be warned that it is better to be content with modest profits, and that sixty per cent., however tempting it may look, is apt to burn their fingers. It has not been laid down that sixty per cent. is unlawful usury; but only that a money-lender who makes an advance to a man who has only just reached his majority, and who is helpless, desperate, and without proper advice, must not be surprised if he is called upon to show that the terms he has exacted are, under the circumstances, fair and reasonable. The responsibility is thrown on the lender of proving, not only the existence of the contract, but its fairness. If the young heir comes to him with a letter of introduction from his father or the family solicitor, the money-lender may feel that he is on safe ground. In any case, if he is aiming at high interest, he had better, for his own security, take care that the borrower has the benefit of competent and independent advice. We have no desire to quarrel with the decision in this particular case; but at the same time we cannot help thinking that the principle which underlies it is a somewhat peculiar one. The theory that a young man arrives at years of discretion

and is capable of managing his own affairs when he reaches twenty-one rests of course on a purely arbitrary assumption. Some young fellows are perfectly able to take care of themselves at seventeen or eighteen, while others at thirty are about as imbecile as anybody has a right to be at twenty. Lord Selborne did not make it quite clear how far he regarded Lord Aylesford's age as a material circumstance in the case. Lord Selborne apparently adopts without reserve the principle affirmed by Lord Hardwicke, that in cases which, "from the circumstances or conditions of the parties contracting—weakness on one side, extortion and advantage taken of that weakness on the other," raise a presumption of fraud, the *onus probandi* lies upon the lender to show that he has not abused his power. It is obvious that a man who has no present means, and who is desperately in want of money, and who has in vain applied to different persons to help him, is at the mercy of the only person who is disposed to make an advance to him. There is no compulsion on the latter to lend the money, and it is not unnatural that he should exact his own terms, and say, "Take it or leave it." To an ordinary mind it is not quite easy to see the logic of allowing a tailor or jeweller to clear a profit of perhaps a hundred per cent., and cutting down a money-lender, who, after all, does at least give up to a certain point real substantial value in hard cash, to five per cent. It would also seem to be rather an abuse of language to talk of a young man in Lord Aylesford's position as being under a "necessity" of borrowing money. He contracted gambling debts (probably with sharpers); he borrowed money from Graham to pay these debts, and then he went to Morris to help him to pay Graham. He had, however, several courses open to him. He might have left the gambling debts unpaid; or he might have left Graham unpaid; or he might have made a clean breast of it to his father, and have taken the consequences. During the last few weeks coals have been a much greater "necessity" to people of all classes than ready money to a spendthrift. It is suspected that the coal-owners and coal-dealers took advantage of that necessity in order to raise their prices. This is a case where there is weakness on one side, extortion and advantage taken of that weakness on the other. It would be interesting to know whether the Court of Chancery would be kind enough to settle for poor householders who cannot do without coals what is a fair price to pay for them. Surely money is only a commodity like anything else. Why should one dealer be allowed to sell coals at any price he chooses, and to raise the price indefinitely in proportion to the weakness and necessity of the consumer, while another man must not sell money to a necessitous person except at a price fixed by a Vice-Chancellor? When it comes to be a question of the competence of a man to make a bargain, it may be suggested that there are very few people really competent to buy a horse or an "old master" on their own judgment, and the Court of Chancery would certainly have plenty to do if it undertook to settle what was a fair price in every transaction where there was weakness on one side and a disposition to take advantage of that weakness on the other. The most effectual means of protecting young heirs is to get their fathers and guardians to do their duty by them properly, instead of trusting to the Court of Chancery. There must, for example, be a good many fathers and guardians connected with the Jockey Club, one of the objects of which, as Admiral Rous has lately explained, is to enable young men who can raise money on the strength of their expectations to ruin themselves under assumed names on the Turf without the knowledge of their relatives. If parents and guardians would use their influence to revise the rules of such an institution as this, and would set a better example to their young men, and take a little more trouble in looking after them, there would be less need of judicial interference. We are indebted to the Court of Chancery for some very sublime principles, but it is difficult to resist an impression that sometimes they are applied in rather a grandmotherly way.

#### RABBITS.

THE speech of the Earl of Malmesbury upon the Game-laws touches the lighter side of a grave and important subject. The figures which he produces, although necessarily questionable, do seem to indicate a great and growing demand for game on behalf of all classes of the population who are able to exercise choice in food. A favourite argument of the opponents of the Game-laws is that three hares consume as much as one sheep, and that one sheep contains more substantial food than three hares. But it is obvious that this argument, if admitted, could be carried much further than its authors would desire. It would, for example, be fatal to the existence of flower-gardens and shrubberies, which occupy land capable for the most part of producing grain or vegetables. It would also require the conversion into tillage of Epping Forest and other open spaces near large towns which lately, for excellent reasons, Parliament has declared its desire to preserve alike from the farmer and the builder. We do not of course assert that all these open spaces could be profitably cultivated, but some of them certainly might; and if they can they clearly ought to be, upon the principle which demands that a sheep should be fed in the place of three hares. The worst that can be said against the hare is that the flesh costs per pound more than mutton; but it might be remarked with equal truth and force that pine-apples cost more to rear than turnips. From the point of view of the enemies of game-preserving there can hardly be

a more indefensible proceeding than the cultivation of hot-house pines. If pines are—which may be doubted—a necessary of life, they may be obtained plentifully and cheaply from the West Indies. But the epicure will object that these pines are inferior in flavour to the product of an English hot-house, just as the Belgian half-tame rabbit is probably inferior to the wild rabbit which infests the English farmer's crops. The epicure has hitherto been allowed to gratify his tastes according to his means, but perhaps the time is coming when he will be arbitrarily suppressed. It would appear, however, from the speech of the Earl of Malmesbury that all classes of Englishmen concur in desiring good eating, and that game is one of the delicacies most highly prized. The Earl, when not engaged in contemplating immortal truths, occupies himself in studying the habits of his humble neighbours. He states, and probably with truth, that with large numbers of the public either rabbits or hares are a favourite Sunday dinner. "Mr. Brooks, the great salesman in Leadenhall Market, receives 1,500 cases of rabbits, each case containing 100 rabbits, every week from Ostend." This figure is quoted by Professor Beesly in an article in the *Fortnightly Review*, as if it represented the total weekly importation from Ostend to London. Assuming this to be so, the fact possesses an importance which Professor Beesly must see, although he is unwilling to confess it. "The crave for rabbits," he says, "is the diseased crave of an urban population for a change of fare." Suppose it is, what then? This "diseased crave" is one of the most universal instincts of civilized mankind, and many writers of authority inform us that it is a wholesome instinct which we ought, as far as we reasonably can, to gratify. The Scotchman in the story says that when he was in England he had roast beef every day and nobody ever heard him complain. But perhaps if he had complained he would not have been unreasonable. However monstrous the idea may seem to Professor Beesly, we think it quite possible to grow tired even of roast mutton and to entertain a "diseased crave" for a boiled rabbit. We might even desire that our rabbit should be the produce, not of a breeding establishment in Belgium, but of an English warren. Professor Beesly objects to the rabbit that he is bony, which certainly is neither his fault nor ours. The *Fortnightly Review* is in the habit of discussing large questions, and therefore we propose to it as a subject for an article to inquire why Providence, if there be a Providence, has not made rabbits without bones. It might be remarked that even legs of mutton contain bones, and some of them are of a length that appears to answer no useful purpose but jumping over gates. To an inexperienced carver the occurrence of bones in joints of meat is as annoying and perplexing as the existence of rocks was to the girl whose lover had gone to sea:—

How can they say that Nature  
Has nothing made in vain?  
Why then beneath the water  
Should hideous rocks remain?

The Londoner, according to Professor Beesly, chooses to pay 7½d. per pound for a bony rabbit, when he can get a shoulder or fore leg of mutton for 9d. per pound, and the nation pays 15,000,000l. a year to gratify this "diseased crave." We will not follow the Professor through the calculations by which he supposes himself to have demonstrated that, by feeding rabbits on that which would feed sheep, the nation loses 15,000,000l. a year. Unless Parliament is prepared to say that sheep shall be substituted for rabbits and turnips for pine-apples, such calculations, even if well founded, are irrelevant. But it is really wonderful what can be done with figures if you try. "It has been calculated that if a rabbit costs 20d., and one in twenty is killed in a year, any rabbit which costs more than one penny to rear is a dead loss to the community." Let us do Professor Beesly the justice to observe that this calculation is not his own, but still he quotes it with approval. We cannot understand either the calculation or the state of mind of the person who propounds it. When it is supposed that one rabbit in twenty is killed in a year, is it implied that the remaining nineteen rabbits go on living indefinitely? If this were true, those nineteen rabbits when they come to market would indeed deserve to be called bony. Does the author of the calculation seriously suppose that a rabbit warren is managed on the principle of killing only one in twenty of the annual produce? If he had not muddled his brain with figures, he might perhaps have perceived that what he wanted to say was this—that the reason why rabbits' flesh is cheaper than butcher's meat is that those who send them to market feed them at the expense of other people. To some extent this may be true; but it can hardly be denied that, if an estate were cleared of game and rabbits, the rent would be justifiably raised. The extreme economists would probably approve of this result; but we have all heard what happened when an enthusiastic disciple of Mr. Mill ventilated his doctrine in Devonshire. We are as a people averse to extreme economy, but if Professor Beesly or anybody else can induce us to modify any clearly wasteful practice, so much the better. The rabbit is in one respect more reasonable than his rival the sheep, for his flesh does not require to be roasted before a large fire; and indeed he never appears to greater advantage than in emerging from a pie, which may be cooked at a common oven without the necessity of any kitchen fire. When Lord Malmesbury discourses upon the fondness of urban populations for rabbits, he may almost be said to have added to his stock of immortal truths. "Such a rabbit-pie, Bill," said Charley Bates to the burglar Sikes, at a time when burglary was a more flourishing profession than it is



now, and its members had no need to put up with bony rabbits. It should be remembered in justice to the rabbit that he is not a traveller like the hare, and there are some districts where he will flourish on land that is good for little else. Suppose that the owner of such land uses it for breeding rabbits, is he not entitled to protection? The law which protects him may be called a game-law, or a trespass-law, or by any other name, but a law there must be for this purpose in a country which pretends to civilization. If there were no such law, a party of two or three men might come with nets and ferrets and carry off a cartload of rabbits to a neighbouring town, where they would be certain to find a market for them. A range of sand-hills along the seashore makes an excellent rabbit warren, and it may be so situated that the rabbits have no access to any food except that which the warren itself supplies. But the more remote such a place is from cultivated land and houses, the more would it be liable to depredations; and if the law did not protect the owner, he would have to protect himself.

Considering that almost every Englishman loves sport, and that even those who do not care for it find game and rabbits acceptable on the dinner-table, we may conclude that either a game-law, or some equivalent for it, is likely to be maintained in England. The same conclusion may be derived from the futility of some of the complaints that are urged against the existing law. Professor Beesly has to deal with the suggestion that a tenant may obtain compensation from his landlord for damage done by game. We should have thought this suggestion reasonable, but the Professor produces a witness who informs us of the result of "such infatuation" in a tenant who sued his landlord. "He gained his claim, 197*l*, and all he received was 4*ol*. Extrajudicial expenses swallowed up the rest." If Professor Beesly were in a calculating mood, he might proceed, from this example of the rapacity of an attorney—a beast *fera natura*, as all authorities agree—to estimate the cost of the entire genus of attorneys to the community. But if the tenant was weak enough to submit to such exaction, the sooner he gives up farming the better, as he must be very unlikely to succeed in that or any other kind of business. If the extrajudicial expenses of a lawsuit swallowed up more than three-fourths of the sum recovered, it is quite time that the Lord Chancellor, or some other law reformer, took the matter in hand. It is a pity that the discussion of a serious subject like the Game-laws should be confused by the introduction of imaginary or sentimental grievances. It may be quite true that many farmers personally dislike gamekeepers, but what of that? The truth is that Professor Beesly's essay is written on the principle that any stick is good enough to beat a dog with. He dislikes the class of game-preservers, and is willing to use every argument, good or bad, that he can find against them. If he intends to emit a general protest against luxurious expenditure, he would be entitled to some sympathy in undertaking a nearly hopeless task. He might denounce, let us say, the racehorse quite as reasonably as he does the rabbit. The racehorse consumes grass or corn upon which some animal more suitable for human food might be reared. By the arithmetical processes of Professor Beesly it might be shown that racehorses cost the country a very large sum yearly. It is alleged, with more or less truth, that racehorses are useful to maintain the quality of other classes of horses which minister more directly to human wants. Racehorses also afford an amusement which is still partially aristocratic, and therefore deserving of the scorn and vituperation of Professor Beesly. The case of the racehorse resembles that of the rabbit, except that the profit which the country gets out of him cannot be so exactly estimated. His flesh doubtless finds its way to market, but dealers in it are shy of quoting prices. The rabbit, on the other hand, is demanded as an article of food with continually increasing eagerness. Lord Malmesbury says that the owner of an estate in Somersetshire was requested to supply a dealer in Birmingham with 10,000 rabbits weekly. We are not informed whether the contract was undertaken; but, suppose it had been, and that rabbits were bred in performance of it, we should like to ask Professor Beesly whether such valuable property as this would not be entitled to the protection of the law. If he concedes this point, as we think he must, the question how protection can best be given would be greatly simplified.

#### COINS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

A move has been made in the right direction; the public have now the opportunity of seeing under glass cases at least a part of the treasures long kept from general view in the Coin Room. Many people have felt that a spirit of exclusiveness has heretofore reigned within the Museum, that works the property of the nation have remained inaccessible to all but a privileged few. It is known that a considerable class exists who, though not deliberate students, and therefore scarcely entitled to ask for the special privilege of having cabinets unlocked for them and trays taken out by officials, have a general and laudable desire to make acquaintance with numismatic works which confessedly form an important, if not indeed an indispensable, link in the history of art. As contrasted with the system hitherto in force within our Museum, a liberal provision prevails in the interest of strangers and of well-conducted visitors in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. The entire collection of coins, consisting of more than 200,000 specimens—that is, a number not much less than the collection in

the British Museum—has been and is arranged in geographical divisions within glass cases. The visitor has but to knock at the door, and is at once admitted to a couple of spacious rooms in which he is allowed to walk freely. We need not dwell on the advantage of having a whole treasury of art and of history thus laid out before the eye. Visitors, especially if they are travellers in a foreign land, do not always know what to ask for. But here in the Hermitage, the coins and medals, by means of labels, are made to speak for themselves, and the stranger naturally turns to works of local, and therefore of national, interest, such as the series of 7,000 Russian coins dating from the tenth century, and the coins of countries such as Poland, once independent, but now subject to Russia. The want of space in the British Museum would of itself preclude so extended a scheme of exhibition from being carried out. In contrast to the liberal principle adopted in St. Petersburg is the shut-up and somewhat proprietary system still in force in parts of Germany. For example, in Saxe-Coburg a choice collection of coins is kept closed in cabinets which visitors can inspect, not of right, but only by privilege. The course now adopted in the British Museum is much to the credit of the authorities. Yet the task which has been undertaken in the best interests of art is by no means free from difficulty; it involves responsibility, with additional labour, mental as well as manual; and the step, once taken, can scarcely stop at its present tentative stage; the scheme doubtless will from time to time be pushed to further completeness.

The plan adopted in the British Museum admits of easy statement. A long case, ranged against the wall in the "Gold Ornament Room," is so constructed as to take thirty-two of the trays from the cabinets in the Coin Room. These trays, which contain a total of about twelve hundred coins, are changed once in every month or six weeks, and thus in course of some years the entire collection will pass under public view. The scheme, though praiseworthy, is obviously not without its disadvantages. For instance, the specimens at any one time exhibited are an isolated fragment rather than a representative series; thus the section we happened to meet with was limited to the Kingdom of Macedon, the time of Hadrian, and the reigns of Edward the Confessor and of Edward III. Hence a visitor must wait a month at least for the continuation of the subject, and, like the reader of a serial story, he may lose the clue to the narrative before the next publication comes round; or he may die before the work reaches its finish. Therefore the arrangement would seem more suited to the casual observer who is content with a partial peep than to the thorough student who naturally wants to master isolated details in relation to the collective whole. Again, in shut-up cases only one side of a coin can be shown; and the system of labels, which is almost essential to the teaching of the uninitiated, can scarcely be carried out in an exhibition which is changed every month. Yet, notwithstanding these defects, which are perhaps beyond remedy, we cannot but feel that a great boon has been granted. And in the future redistribution of the Museum consequent on the removal of the Natural History collections to Kensington, it may be anticipated that space will be found for the display of all medals proper and medallions. The public always feel more interest in originals than in copies, even though it be impossible for them to discriminate between an electro cast and the real coin. The magnificent series of plaster casts in the New Museum, Berlin, affects the imagination very differently from the original marbles in the Vatican or in the British Museum. In the same way it is much more satisfactory to examine the actual coins which bear on their faces a biga, a temple, or the head of an emperor or of a king, than to look at the most perfect of transcripts. A copy always seems to be one remove too far off from the author's thought and hand; the subtle niceties of execution may possibly be blurred by accident. And when it becomes a question of exciting or creating a general interest, there can be little doubt that the veritable historic works around which have gathered the associations of centuries are more potent educators of the people than any copies. Certainly we know of few spots in Europe where the mind is thrown more into an historic attitude, or is induced to take a tone more in keeping with antiquity, than the Gold Room of the Museum, where are ranged in the centre and around the walls antique gems, Etruscan gold work, and these twelve hundred original coins.

The varied contents of the Museum, comprising coins, gems, vases, bronzes, terra cottas, marbles, &c., enable the student to elucidate any one art by its sister arts. For example, we have found it instructive to turn from coins to the neighbouring gems in order to trace analogous compositions from precious metals to precious stones. In the same way we have felt it interesting to compare the head of the Emperor Hadrian in the flat on a gold coin with the head of the same Emperor in the round as seen in the noble bust in the gallery below. In like manner the Museum furnishes ample material by which even the tiro may become acquainted with the rise and development of historic styles, and with the essential principles which in all great schools have governed art treatments. Thus the principles of basso-relievo and of alto-relievo, on which excellence in the design of coins and medals greatly depends, will receive ample illustration in the matchless series of reliefs in marble from Athens, Halicarnassus, and Lycia. It may be instructive to try all works, whether on gems or in precious metals, by the standard reached in the Acropolis of Athens, the Procession on the frieze being the most perfect of known treatments in the flat, while the Metopes are good examples in higher relief. Difference of material and diversity

in scale no doubt impose variety in treatment, yet analogies, even in subject-matter, are patent, as when a chariot and horses are delineated as well on the Parthenon frieze as in miniature on a small Greek coin. One lesson which such comparisons seem to teach is the essential unity of all arts irrespectively of mere material. The material is but a medium through which the artist's thought obtains expression.

The value of coins as records of destroyed monuments has been contested. Addison, in his "Dialogues on Medals," says with some stretch of fancy that you may see on them "the plans of many of the most considerable buildings of old Rome," and that he knows "an ingenious gentleman of our nation, extremely well versed in this study, who has the design of publishing the whole history of architecture, with its several improvements and decays, as it is to be met with on ancient coins." On the other hand, it has been objected that on medals one temple is made to resemble other temples, that sometimes a part serves to represent the whole, and that often a conventional type is used by way of symbol for the reality. Such a liberty, for example, seems to have been taken with the Flavian Amphitheatre in a large bronze in the British Museum. Indeed, Professor Donaldson, in his *Architectura Numismatica*, frankly admits that in this representation "it will be perceived that the utmost license of conventional freedom has been exercised, in order to enable the artist effectively to give the most striking features of the monument, and yet convey a correct notion of the several parts." Nevertheless it cannot be doubted that this and other medals furnish data which enable archaeologists in some important points to restore the ruin now known as the Colosseum. But of more immediate interest to us in England at this moment are the medals which illustrate the great Temple of Diana at Ephesus. Here the lower parts of the columns bear marks which have been taken as signs of sculpture, according to the words of Pliny that "thirty-six of the columns were carved, and one of them by Scopas." Professor Donaldson, writing more than ten years before the recent discoveries at Ephesus, says, "The evidence of the coin is irresistible, and, however qualified, must be admitted." The correctness of this interpretation is now placed beyond question by the presence in the Museum of a sculptured drum from one of the thirty-six columns bearing on its surface Mercury, with Victory, or Eros, and other figures not so easily named. It is seldom that corroborative evidence proves so conclusive; the text of Pliny, coins, and the marbles themselves are all agreed. It needs no doubt some experience to read correctly coins bearing structural designs; the scale on which the modeller or engraver had to work was so small that very much was of necessity left out. Thus architectural diagrams have to be read as shorthand; compared with photographs the transcripts may be said to be phonetic; in other words, the errors are more on the side of subtraction than of addition.

The exhibition, changed from month to month, of the collective riches of the Museum is supplemented by electrotypes from representative works. The idea when fully carried out is to present to the eye a synopsis of numismatic art, to display the geographic area and the chronologic development of the art of coining in all countries of the civilized world. Only since the discovery of the electrotype process has such a project been practicable. So perfect is this means of reproduction that even experts do not always find it easy to distinguish the copy from the original. And one advantage which this multiplication of replicas secures is the ready display of the two faces of a medal side by side. The present comparatively small exhibition, which we may hope is but the promise of better things to come, clearly shows the advantage of the method. Hitherto the space at command suffices for little more than electrotypes from Greek master-works and from gold coins of the Emperors of the West and of the East. But like casts are in course of preparation which will extend this representative series into English history. Only the most significant products of a nation or of a period appear in the selection, and thus a clear digest is obtained of a subject which otherwise might seem perplexed by intricate detail. For the sake also of simplicity, and in order, it may be, that art as distinguished from archaeology shall be paramount, special prominence is given to the epochs when art was at its prime. For this end chronological development is made to give way to geographic divisions which display numismatic art at its highest point in the chief centres of the old world. Thus in this compendium are comprised Greece, Ionia, Sicily, Magna Græcia, Crete, Asia, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain. In a lecture at the Royal Institution Mr. Stuart Poole attempted to show the characteristics of leading schools of Greek art as traced in the coins, in the following epigrammatic terms:—"The school of Greece is sculpture-like; the school of Ionia picture-like; the school of Sicily and Italy gem-like; the school of Crete realistic; and the school of Asia architectural." The chronological arrangement has been fitly adopted in the disposition of the electros from the gold coins of the Roman Emperors; thus the rise, the zenith, and the fall of Roman art are successively exemplified. The best period, as might be expected, is about the reign of Augustus. A marked contrast of course becomes apparent between the coins of the Western and of the Eastern Empire; the Western correspond in style with Roman statues, architecture, and ornament; while the Eastern or Byzantine coins accord in type of heads and decorative details with Byzantine mosaics. That some Emperors are not known even by name otherwise than by coins is a striking proof of the help which the numismatist may afford to the historian. We would further remark on the use of these coins at the critical turn-

ing point when Christian art was emerging out of Paganism. The heads of Christ on the gold coins we have examined correspond closely to the well-known Byzantine type, and thus furnish confirmatory evidence of the now accepted belief that the so-called portraits of Christ are nothing more than conventional and traditional types, handed down, it is true, from generation to generation, yet always moulded and modified according to the style of each place and period.

We are glad to know that the collection in the Museum is not at a standstill. Already it compares well with the richest collections on the Continent. In examples of the schools of Greece, and in specimens of Roman gold, it is not surpassed by the treasures at St. Petersburg, Paris, or Vienna. The yearly additions are necessarily dependent on the Treasury; last year the Government advanced 10,000*l.* Unfortunately the universal rise in prices has extended even to coins; hence any fixed annual grant becomes from year to year less adequate to meet the wants of the Museum. The French war for the moment paralysed the market; but now again the prices given in France are high. A coin needed by the Museum may sometimes be lost unless 100*l.* or 200*l.* can be afforded. But the collection under its present direction is not likely to remain without development. The public may be glad to learn that the project of preparing an Illustrated Catalogue of the 50,000 Greek Coins has made considerable advance. Every important specimen will be engraved. The first volume, which includes Etruria and Magna Græcia, will appear this spring, and the second, which treats of Sicily, will not be delayed beyond a year. This work, like the Catalogue of the Vases already published, is expressly for the use of students; it will be prized on the Continent as much as in England.

## REVIEWS.

### DÖLLINGER ON THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.\*

IF mankind were able to learn in anything like proportion to their experience, they would have learned by this time, what they certainly have not learned, that, though it is easy to break, it is very difficult to mend. If there is an organic law of the Christian society to be traced in the New Testament, it is the law of unity. On each several occasion which has in the course of centuries led to a breach of that unity, those who must be supposed to have felt themselves bound in conscience to accept division and separation in order to maintain truth and right probably thought that the necessity under which they seemed to act would be but temporary; that the corruptions or oppression against which they protested would in time disappear with their upholders, and that when the tyranny was overpast, and the error fully exposed, unity would return with returning reason and sober judgment. It is curious to speculate how many of these disruptions would have been risked if those responsible for them had been able to look forward, and to see that the tyranny might pass and the error be cleared up or surrendered, but that the rent would be incurable. It might have been thought beforehand so obvious and natural that, when the heat of a controversy or a quarrel had died away with the progress of time, the strong forces in Christianity tending to peace and union would resume their paramount influence; that broken ties would be knit together again; that good feeling and calm sense, to say nothing of Christian charity, would easily arrange differences; that sects and minorities would run their course, and then be reabsorbed in the large public body from which they split off. But we know that, though nations may make peace, Churches are irreconcilable. In the whole course of Church history it is hard to find a single clear instance of genuine voluntary reunion between separated bodies. Order and liberty, unity and truth, an honest conscience and peace, may be adjusted to one another, and may long coexist in a religious community; but once let the tension of their rival influences overcome its cohesion, once let the real or alleged claims of liberty, truth, and conscience require secession, and we may safely prophesy that, whatever becomes of the separated fractions, an amputated limb will grow again before their division is healed. One or both may perish, or may pass into something different; but it is most unlikely that they will ever, as bodies, come together once more.

And yet it is impossible to conceive anything more monstrous than this impossibility of reconciliation between Christian bodies which has hitherto been found to be almost the rule in Church history. All the noblest and best minds in all the divisions of Christendom rebel against it, and earnestly protest against erecting the formidable fact into a necessary condition of religious society. There can be no doubt that it is one of those cases where it is as right not to yield to the discouragement of countless failures as it is right for the martyr to maintain his convictions of the unseen truth, and the certainty of its triumph, with the world against him and death before him. When, then, a divine like Dr. Dollinger, seconded by a disciple who is so worthy to represent him as Mr. Oxenham, invites our thought to the prospects of the "Reunion of the Churches," we listen with the keenest interest and the deepest respect. If only because they are bolder and more hopeful than the mass of us, they command our attention.

\* *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches.* By J. J. von Dollinger, D.D. Translated, with Preface, by H. Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1872



If attempts in the same direction have hitherto failed, adequate reasons can be assigned in each case for the failure; it does not follow that they must always fail. The time may not have been ripe for them; the idea, like many other ideas which have at last found their way into practical life, may need great changes in man's thought and knowledge and circumstances before it can be realized. At any rate it is one which, if it is to be realized, must be kept prominently before the minds of Christians; which, even if we are not to see it realized, we need to have kept before us as a measure of our shortcomings. Dr. Döllinger has claims on attention such as very few men possess. He has few equals in his knowledge of the causes which have led to the divisions of the Church, and which keep those divisions alive. Few Protestants have understood the ease of Catholics and sympathized with them, as he, alone among Catholics of his eminence, has understood and sympathized with Protestants and Greeks. And, next, anxious as he is for reunion and sanguine of its possibility, he is so resolute and unflinching in his loyalty to truth that, when acquiescence in fraud and falsehood was the alternative, he deliberately chose to countenance by a fresh example the policy of separation. Truth is with him above the unity, the unity apparently unbroken and impregnable, of the most imposing portion of Christendom. The only reunion he will think of is one based on definite and positive avowals of truth; of that which ignores differences, and hides them under ambiguities and compromises, he will have none. It may seem idle to think of reunion on such terms; but at least they are the only fair and reasonable terms, the only terms on which a man of serious convictions could think of it; and on these terms, undaunted by the actual appearance of the world, Dr. Döllinger bids us not despair of reunion. The

"Nestor of Catholic theology," speaking [so Mr. Oxenham writes] from a profound acquaintance with the past history of the Church, and an intimate familiarity with the present condition of both Catholic and Protestant society, he declares that union to be at once the supreme necessity of the Christian commonwealth and a perfectly practicable achievement. It is not the voice of a youthful zealot, or a dreamy mystic, or a fiery reformer, which addresses us, but a venerable friend full of years and of honours, cautious by temperament, and of a nation pre-eminent for its critical acumen, conservative and Catholic to the backbone in his instincts and habits, who sums up in these weighty words the concentrated convictions of a lifetime.

What is there, then, in the circumstances of the time to induce a man like Dr. Döllinger to think that this union of Christendom, hitherto attempted in vain, is now "a perfectly practicable achievement"? We ask the question with the most sincere wish to agree with him, and with the fullest recognition of the calmness and candour with which he surveys the scene. The favouring circumstances which present themselves to his mind seem to be mainly these. In the first place, the events of the last few years have paved the way for a reconciliation between the two greatest bodies of Christendom—the Latin Church of the West, and the chief representative of Oriental Christianity, the Russian Church. It is clear that he thinks that the proverb must come true of the Papal system, that when things are at the worst, they must soon mend. The Vatican decree is the climax of that intolerable tyranny long exercised by the Jesuit party in the name of the Pope; and the result of it must be a general reaction and revolt in the Latin Church against this tyranny, which shall place the Papacy in its true constitutional position, a position in accordance with the genuine tradition of the ancient Church. With a Latin Church which has got rid of the irresponsible despotism established in the Roman Curia, supported by the inflexible policy of the Jesuits, and consecrated by the Vatican decree, the greatest and most serious hindrance to union with the Eastern Church will have been removed; the two great bodies are at bottom agreed in doctrine, and the real bar to reconciliation is the usurped power of the Popes. Another sign is the increased spirit of sympathy in the English Church towards the great traditional Churches both of West and East from which she has so long kept aloof—a sympathy developed directly from the doctrinal and historical position of the English Church, which, in spite of the strong Protestant temper dominant in England, has never let go her hold on Christian antiquity, and whose most learned divines and most consistent schools have always laid the greatest stress on this unbroken connexion. Lastly, in the new circumstances of Germany Dr. Döllinger sees a great source of encouragement. Everything has told of late to disengage Catholic Germany from Rome; and what tends to disengage German Catholics from Rome turns their thoughts towards reconciliation with their Protestant countrymen, who were driven reluctantly into separation by precisely the same policy of insolent fraud and imposture which has just now so profoundly shocked the conscience and intellect of devout and learned Catholics. And since Dr. Döllinger's Lectures were published the attitude and claims of the Roman Court have turned a religious quarrel into a political one, and have brought the Pope face to face with the new German Empire, as the secret enemy of German unity and the intriguer against its peace. We know what such a feeling has brought about in former times; our own times are hardly likely to be more patient. And whatever weakens the attraction of Germany to Rome is an opening and advantage towards a unity which shall be independent of it—a unity which, however much men desire it, they will not accept coupled with the condition of submission to Rome.

Dr. Döllinger looks to Germany as the most hopeful source and guide of this movement:—

At the beginning of any irenic movement, its opponents will outnumber

its friends and helpers. But we may count on the sympathy, if not the active help, of those who have at heart the greatness and unity of Germany, and who believe that the political union is but half the work and requires an ecclesiastical union of all its tribes as the completion, fulfilment, and crowning of the edifice. In Germany the two religions are constantly becoming more and more intermingled, and the artificial devices for keeping them apart are more and more felt to be disturbing and hindering influences, superseded by the movement and needs of the present, and are being gradually put aside. . . . I have found it the almost universal conviction in foreign countries that it is the special mission of Germany to take the lead in this world-wide question, and to give to the movement its form, measure, and direction. We are the heart of Europe, richer in theologians than all other lands, and the linguistic knowledge indispensable for this task exists with us in a higher degree than anywhere else. What can, what ought to be done? A negotiation between Churches through plenipotentiaries accredited on either side promises no result; the mere proposal or attempt would now, after July 18, 1870, be folly. The right instrument would be found in men, both of the clergy and laity, who would unite for common action, first in Germany, untrammelled by instructions, and simply following their own mind and judgment. They would soon draw others to them in rapidly increasing numbers, by the magnetic power of work so pure and well pleasing to God, and would thus be brought into communication with like-minded men in other countries. The basis of their consultations would be Holy Scripture with the three *Œcumenical Creeds*, interpreted by the still undivided Church of the early centuries. Then would an international society be formed of the noblest and most beneficial kind, and which, begun as a snowball, might well become an irresistible avalanche.

If Germany were the world, or if the world were like Germany, these expectations might appear better grounded. But large elements have been left out of the calculation. If the Eastern Church were attracted, what about the Latin populations? What about Italy, Spain, and Ultramontane France? What about the strong anti-Catholic element in the English Church? What about the 126 sects of English Nonconformists, fiercely insular, fiercely suspicious of Popery, or of anything which their ignorance or their instinct confounds with Popery? What about the land of triumphant sectarianism, the United States? Do they give much promise of coming into a scheme of reunion like this? The writer and the translator of these interesting lectures will seem to most persons to be too sanguine in speaking of the union which they long for and urge on Christians as a "perfectly practicable achievement." "Why," asks Mr. Oxenham, "is reunion considered an 'idle dream'?" "Simply because we choose to make it so." But who are the "we" with whom it rests? Not himself and those who sympathize with him, but all the Churches, and sects, and parties, and single minds and souls, with all their separate convictions, and traditions, and prejudices, and interests, all over the Christian world. And who is to make all these infinitely differing views and habits and inherited opinions converge to the point where variations may be adjusted and agreement may become possible? who is to attract to any common ground, even for discussion and deliberation, bodies and individuals so remote in distance, and still more remote in ideas and sympathies?

And yet it is no useless task to which Dr. Döllinger has devoted himself. He seems to us more of a mere pioneer than he conceives himself to be; but it is enough even for a writer of his position and ability to be but a pioneer in the cause which so interests him. Before any such result as he contemplates can be even approximately reached, there must be a long, a very long and doubtful, work of breaking up the ground. Evidently the public mind is still absolutely unprepared even to take in the conception of such a reconciliation as he has in view. The disintegration of what still holds together, the destruction of what is established—this it can understand; but the fusing into a stable cohesion elements which have long been kept apart, the reconstruction of Christendom on larger and nobler principles than have yet ruled in it—this we are yet a long way from regarding as a thing of practical interest. All that can be said is, that there is more chance of gaining a hearing for words of truth and soberness about such questions than there was when Calixtus and Santa Clara, and Leibnitz and Molanus, and Wake and Dupin ventured to feel their way towards counsels of peace. If many differences have since their days become consolidated and hardened by time, if extreme opinions have become more extreme, yet there is a wider and better-informed public opinion than they had, and one less embarrassed by political considerations, to listen to and judge of reasonable and serious arguments. For the sake of generations to come it is well to familiarize our own generation with the two great points of truth on which Dr. Döllinger in his lectures and Mr. Oxenham in his eloquent preface insist. One is the monstrous anomaly of the existing state of division of the Christian Church; an anomaly which, familiar as it has become to us as an existing fact, no prescription can ever legitimate, no excuse can ever palliate as a fatal violation of the very idea of Christianity, and which is obviously and confessedly the poisonous influence for which there is no antidote, sapping its strength and arresting its advance. The other point is the extravagant and absurd insignificance of the greater part of the causes of separation and disunion. To each particular separated body the points of doctrine which keep it separate seem, of course, to be of paramount and supreme importance; but they are likely to appear so to none but its own partisans. There are two subjects on which to differ is necessarily to find it impossible to unite with any truth and reality in religious association. To differ about the object of worship, and to differ about the source and guarantee of religious truth, must be and ought to be, as long as they last, fatal bars to union. It never can be taken as a matter of indifference whether we refuse worship and all that goes with worship to one who is entitled to it, or whether we give worship to one who is but a

creature. And, again, it cannot be a matter of indifference, for it must be either the first of human blessings or the worst of human impostures, whether or not we believe that there is in the world, in the flesh like ourselves and speaking human words, a living oracle of divine truth, who may be consulted on all the difficulties and dangers of thought and life, and whose voice is certainly and without fail equivalent to the answer of God himself. Between divergent convictions on these two fundamental conditions of religious belief there can be no compromise; and no religious community could, without losing that which made it religious, embrace them together. But, besides these two points, it is difficult to name a third, absolutely and *in limine* fatal to an honest attempt to reunite a shattered Christendom. Certain it is that many grave points of difference which in former times have been thought insuperable obstacles to union have sunk more and more into differences of aspect or point of view, perfectly compatible with sincere co-operation and a large measure of sympathy. Dr. Dollinger enumerates a number of questions on which great changes have come either on the Catholic or the Protestant mind, where these questions have been reviewed and examined with competent knowledge, and on a higher level than that of urgent and keen controversy. The Lutheran article of justification is still of interest to numbers, and will still be of interest as long as St. Augustine is studied and human experience remains the same; but it has not the factitious supremacy which it once had, as the article of a standing or falling Church. Questions about the efficacy and administration of the sacraments, about church discipline, such as celibacy and the self-devoted life, about our relations to the other world, such as the intermediate state, the invocation of Saints and prayers for the departed, are all questions on which the deepest and most legitimate interest is felt, and on which the right or the wrong is of the greatest consequence; but they are questions which are more and more recognized as having two sides, and admitting of being looked at from varied points of view. There is a wide margin relating to them within which members of the same Church might fairly differ. How the lines are to be traced which shall comprehend these differences, Dr. Dollinger does not adequately show us. But it is no small service that he renders to Christendom when he reminds us, not only as a learned man, but as a sincere Catholic, how much wider these lines of comprehension ought to be than any of those with which use and custom have made us familiar.

#### DASENT'S JEST AND EARNEST.\*

THE students of the great series of *Chronicles and Memorials*—which, it is to be hoped, will suffer nothing though Lord Romilly should cease to be Master of the Rolls, or though there should cease to be any Master of the Rolls at all—have been for years waiting for an edition of those Scandinavian Sagas which bear upon the history of Britain from the hand of Mr. Dasent. Mr. Dasent more than obeys the precept of Horace about the ninth year. His *Collection of Sagas* was advertised as “in the press” in 1860, and it was still advertised as “in the press” in 1872. Meanwhile, scholars have been feeling the lack. There is really no trustworthy and accessible edition of those Scandinavian tales, whether we choose to call them legend or history, which, great as is the caution with which they must be used, are still one of the materials for English history during several centuries. Any accessible edition of them would be a gain; a really critical edition would be an unspeakable gain. During all these years Mr. Dasent has mocked us by the promise of an edition which we fondly hoped might turn out to be something like what we want. For all these years he has been waiting in vain:—

μήλλον γὰρ αἰετὴν τι τὰς οὐσας τί μοι  
καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἰκπιδας διαθήσειν.

Many has been the time that we should have been rejoiced to be able to turn to such an edition of the Sagas as we hoped that Mr. Dasent's, when it came, would turn out to be. We have waited more patiently, but not less unsuccessfully, than the ancient worshippers of Baal. Whether Mr. Dasent has been sleeping it is not for us to guess; that he has been several times on a journey we gather from the two volumes before us. From these volumes also we learn that he has been writing divers squibs and articles, while from other sources we know that he has been writing a novel. But what comfort is all this to us, who have been all this time wanting our Sagas in a shape in which we could make use of them? And now we have something which, for anything we know, Mr. Dasent may be giving us instead of the boon for which we have so long been looking. If so, we can only say that it is not a little cruel to give us so hard a stone instead of the long promised bread. It is cruel when Mr. Dasent, instead of a critical edition of Sagas, gives us a sort of summary of Sagas without any criticism. It is more cruel still when, instead of Sagas or anything else about the Faroe Islands, he gives us, under the title of “A Fortnight in Faroe,” page after page of the poorest and dullest cockney joking. We know not for what kind of public Mr. Dasent may have put forth his two volumes of *Jest and Earnest*. It certainly cannot be for the scholars whom he has so long mocked with the vain hope of getting something from him which might really help them in their studies.

\* *Jest and Earnest. A Collection of Essays and Reviews.* By George Webb Dasent, D.C.L. 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, 1873.

We are in fact quite at a loss to guess with what motive Mr. Dasent can have put forth what he is pleased to call his *Essays and Reviews*. We should really have thought that a man who has somehow got a reputation for knowledge of Scandinavian matters, and who has had the honour of being chosen as a fellow-worker with such scholars as those who have edited the later volumes of the *Chronicles and Memorials*, should have had more respect for himself and his subject than to treat a matter of such interest as a voyage to Faroe in a style which brings him down to the level of Mr. Jeaffreson or Mr. Hepworth Dixon. Why cannot he tell us where he went and what he saw in that curious island scrap of Scandinavia, without bringing it in with a hideous mass of rubbish about “Smith,” and “Paterfamilias,” and the London season, and bathing at Dieppe, and all the lowest jargon of the cockney penny-a-liner, who fancies that all the world lives in London? A sensible traveller, knowing the language and history of the country, as we are bound to assume that Mr. Dasent does, could have told us a good deal about so very curious and out-of-the-way a part of the world. And a long-suffering reader may by a series of efforts dig up several pieces of information out of the dreary waste of Mr. Dasent's liveliness. But the effort is a painful one, and puts him who makes it pretty much on a level with the unlucky whales whose merciless butchery Mr. Dasent tells us about. When Mr. Dasent lights upon a good thing, he does not seem to know what to do with it. He hears a story about seals turning into women, and it does not strike him that he has lighted on a rich vein of comparative mythology. The utmost that he does, which is doubtless some self-sacrifice for Mr. Dasent, is to keep himself from making any cockney joke while telling the story. In the next paper he goes to Wildbad, but he cannot get there without an overpowering flood of cockneyism, which, when he gets to his bath, changes into such elegant wit as calling one of his fellow-visitors “Prince Ringwormowski.” How all this stuff ever found its way into a periodical like the *North British Review*, which certainly contained some articles of a very different stamp, is even harder to understand than how Mr. Dasent himself could first write and then after eight years reprint them.

It is hardly needful to dwell on two political squibs twenty years old which Mr. Dasent has actually thought it worth while solemnly to reprint, or on some more cockney nonsense called “How we were all Vaccinated,” stuff about “Mrs. Jellybag,” “Mr. Squills,” “Struggles,” and “The housekeeper's room,” the sort of thing which might, by an effort, be endured in a comic newspaper, but which we should have thought that no human creature would have dreamed of printing in a book. But here it all is, and we suppose it makes up Mr. Dasent's division of *Jest* alongside of what we suppose is meant for *Earnest*, namely, the papers on the English Language and on Norwegian History. Mr. Dasent calmly tells us in his preface, “They now reappear just as they were originally written, though the writer well knows that the world has not stood still either in politics or literature during the last twenty years.” The years 1863 and 1864, in which Mr. Dasent wrote most of the articles, are as yet hardly twenty years ago, though the paper on the Origin of the English Language, written in 1856, comes nearer to that, we might almost say, distant time. Mr. Dasent's apology shows that he knows that these papers are behind the present state of knowledge; it is no shame to him that they are so; it is not given to every man to lead the way; but every man may follow the path when it is once pointed out. We neither wonder at Mr. Dasent nor blame him because, writing about the Origin of the English Language in 1856, he wrote in an unscientific and blundering way about Britons, Semi-Saxons, and what not. What we do wonder at, what we do blame him for, is his reprinting this kind of thing unaltered in 1873. If Mr. Dasent had only marked the things about which he knows better in 1873 than he did in 1856, we should at least have a picture of the progress of his mind, whatever that might be worth. But, as it is, he does not even give us this. All that we can see is, that Mr. Dasent knows that the world has not stood still in all these years, but that he will not take the trouble to make any use of its advance.

The third paper in the first volume is headed “England and Norway in the Eleventh Century,” and is also reprinted from the *North British Review*. This, we presume, is one of the essays which come under the head of “*Earnest*.” We are bound to say that there is nothing in it about “Smith,” or “Struggles,” or “Paterfamilias.” There is nothing about Mr. Dasent bathing at Dieppe, or his being jaded with the London season. But it is no paper which promises very much for the critical character of Mr. Dasent's edition of the Sagas, whenever we get it. His paper is dated in 1865; but, as he chooses to reprint it in 1873, we must judge it by the light of 1873, and not by that of 1865. But, even by the standard of 1865, it is sadly uncritical. First of all, the title is misleading. Who would have thought that “England and Norway in the Eleventh Century” meant nothing more than the story of the reigns of Edward the Confessor and Harold, told according to Mr. Dasent's notion of them? And really no man in 1865 should have written such a sentence as this:—

Ingulph, the secretary of William, indeed denies that at that visit his master exerted any undue influence on Edward to extort a promise from him; but who can tell—no, not even in aftertimes the hired scribe of William—what passed between the cousins?

It is certainly a strange state of things when a man who is thought capable of work on the *Chronicles and Memorials* could, in 1865, think the stories of the false Ingulf worthy of



serious discussion, and could calmly reprint in 1873 this witness that he was a good deal behind his age eight years before. After this specimen, it is perhaps hardly worth while to go into any very minute examination of Mr. Dasent's notions about eleventh century history. He has made use of the *Life of Edward* published by Mr. Luard, and that is all that we can say for him. To all that has been done for this period of history since 1865 Mr. Dasent resolutely shuts his eyes. We have all the different versions of Harold's visit to Normandy, run over in a light and flippant way, as if the evidence on which they severally rest had never been critically tested. Mr. Dasent tells us that the visit happened in 1064, a date certainly less improbable than most others, but which is hardly to be taken for granted. Then he tells us:—

Certain it is that soon after that visit Edward sent Harold's brother Wulfnoth, and his nephew Sweyn's son Haco, who had been given by Godwin as hostages over to William for safe-keeping.

Any one who has really worked at the different statements, and not tripped jauntily over them, will perhaps think that this story, like all the other stories, is anything but certain. We need hardly say that the Norwegian legend of Stamfordbridge, the English cavalry, the English archers, and so forth, is told over again as if it were so much true history; only Mr. Dasent does stop to point out the mistake of the myth-maker—one simply of a piece with the rest of the story—which kills Morkere at Fulford. At the authentic account in Henry of Huntingdon he seems never to have looked, but he gets into a critical fit over Waitz's edition of *Marianus Scotus*. But of the real meaning of *Marianus's* account, and of its utter inconsistency with the Norwegian fable, Mr. Dasent seems to have no notion whatever.

In the second volume we get a review of the early parts of Latham's *Johnson's Dictionary*. This dates in 1864. Mr. Dasent gives us over again a good deal of the same kind of thing which is to be found in the earlier essay on the Origin of the English Language; but he does seem to have advanced in one point between 1856 and 1864. As early as 1848 Dr. Guest had explained the real meaning of the "Saxon shore;" but in 1856 Mr. Dasent had not reached the point which Dr. Guest had reached at least eight years earlier, and, in the essay on the Origin of the English Language, he talked all the old talk about its being called from a German settlement to which since Dr. Guest no scholar has listened. In the paper written in 1864 this does not appear again, so it is just possible that Mr. Dasent may have spent his second term of eight years—the great cyclic period, according to Lappenberg—in learning a little about early English history at the hands of its great master. In the essay itself Mr. Dasent undertakes the easy task of convicting Dr. Latham of a good many mistakes. But Mr. Dasent is himself really a good deal more uncritical than Dr. Latham. He seems to have no idea whatever of the nature of the English language, or of any language. He goes on talking, in the old blundering way, about modern English words being "derived from the Anglo-Saxon;" only he objects to "deriving" them from the Anglo-Saxon, because he wants to "derive" them from the Scandinavian. In short, like most people who touch Scandinavian matters, Mr. Dasent has got bitten with the Berserker madness. The fault of most Scandinavian writers on English matters is that, whenever they see anything in England which is the least like anything in Denmark or Norway, whether it be in language or in anything else, they at once rush at it as something of direct Scandinavian origin—something brought into England by Hubba or Cnut—whereas, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, the likeness is simply owing to the original kindred of the English and Scandinavian nations. And English writers who take up a strong Scandinavian line are apt to fall into just the same error as the native Danes and Northmen. Mr. Dasent, for instance, sees Scandinavians wherever he has the ghost of a chance. He will make everything Scandinavian which could possibly be Scandinavian. Now no one doubts that the Danish invasions, like the other events of our history, had some effect on our language. No one doubts that there is a Scandinavian element in the existing English speech; but how great that element is we shall never find out unless we set about it in a more critical and a less impetuous way than Mr. Dasent. Anything in modern English which cannot be traced up to the existing remains of the oldest English, which has nothing like it in any of the continental forms of the Low-Dutch, but which has something like it in Scandinavian, may be safely set down as a real Scandinavian infusion into English; but further than this it is not safe to go. Mr. Dasent's notions of the history of language during the eleventh and twelfth centuries are truly remarkable when we think that they are deliberately given to the world in 1873:—

The King and his barons spoke Norman French, their subjects and serfs, whether Scandinavians or Saxons, might speak whatever jargon they chose. It never occurred to the Conqueror or his sons, or to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, that a Norman could be anything else than a Norman, or his speech anything else than Norman.

Normans and Angevins are most likely all the same to Mr. Dasent, but what does he make of William's attempt to learn English? of the English education of Henry the First? of the fact that Henry the Second, whether he could speak English or not, most certainly understood it when spoken? These things were perhaps not so clear in 1864 as they are in 1873; but there are some people who keep their eyes open to the last lights as they come. Mr. Dasent chooses rather to stay where the last revolution of the octennial cycle left him.

One page of Mr. Dasent's book—namely, page 337 of the first volume—emphatically reminds us that, in his own phrase, the world has not stood still during the last twenty years. Mr. Dasent's essay, written in 1856, brings strongly home to us the fact that the Semi-Saxon was then in the land. He has indeed something like a page to himself—at least his name stands in all the glory of a heading. In the text Mr. Dasent says, "We have called the speech of England in the time of John Semi-Saxon. Why not," he goes on, "call it Anglo-Saxon?" The answer, we confess, is beyond us; but that is not wonderful, as the whole nature of the Semi-Saxon is beyond us. However, here it is:—

Because during that century and a half the internal law of simplification and progression had continued to exert its influence on the language in an increased ratio of speed.

A few pages on we read:—

The dialects cease to be called Anglo-Norman on one side or Semi-Saxon on the other. The common term Early English includes them both.

The time when this happened seems to have been in the thirteenth century, and it also seems as if Mr. Dasent thought that people at the time talked about Anglo-Norman and Semi-Saxon. Perhaps a man of mixed blood might say, "My father talked Anglo-Norman and my mother talked Semi-Saxon; as for me, I talk Early English." After all this we are not surprised to find a few pages before this Mr. Dasent talking of "the sack and burning of Anderida by the sons of *Cerdic*," and adding, "but for a long time such a capture was an exception."

A great part of the second volume is taken up, not by a critical examination of the Sagas, but with an account of the reigns of Magnus the Good and Harold Hardrada according to the Sagas. This makes us tremble a little for the coming edition.

Of course there are, scattered up and down Mr. Dasent's essays, things of a different character from those which we have quoted. He makes, for instance, some good protests against some of the modern corruptions of English, and against filling dictionaries with words which are not words but merely technical terms. There is a good deal in Mr. Dasent's two volumes which is quite to the purpose, but then it is for the most part quite commonplace. It is the old story that what is true is not new, and what is new is not true. But, when a man thinks good to reprint his fugitive pieces, and that, according to his own confession, without any kind of correction or improvement, we may fairly ask that they should rise to a higher level than this.

#### SAGAS FROM THE FAR EAST.\*

AT the end of his preface the author of this volume apologizes for "any inaccuracies which may have crept into" his "pages owing to being abroad while preparing them for the press." The plea is elastic; but if it be suffered to cover not a few sins in the way of mistranslation, or of wrong transcription of names from German into English, it can scarcely be taken as an excuse for making Mongolians talk Sanskrit, and still less for the form which he has chosen to give to his book. He has written it, he tells us, especially for the young; that is, for those whom it is specially necessary to place in the right track at a time when misdirection may send them permanently and fatally astray. When, then, boys and girls, in reading what is put before them as a Calmuck or Mongolian tale, find the narrator saying that "a voice came out of *Searga*," and are referred to a note which consists simply of a quotation on the origin of the word from Lassen's work on the *Mahâ Bhârata*, what can they suppose but that Hindus and Mongols talk much the same language, or have at least the same names for their objects of worship? But if even this be condoned, indulgence cannot fairly be carried further.

Popular tales, from whatever quarter they may come, have attractions for two sets of readers, and have therefore a twofold value. It is a distinct gain when any addition is made to the stock of stories in which children may take pleasure simply as stories; and it is next to certain that these stories will have a further scientific value for the comparative mythologist and the historical student. But, whether for those who read for amusement only, or for those who take them up as serious work, there are only three ways in which such stories should be put forth. To the publication of the mere text, provided it be accurate, without note or comment, there can be no objection; but if either notes or comments are to be made, they should be confined to matters really needed to explain the text; or, secondly, to the history of these traditions and to their connexion, if any such should exist, with the traditions or stories of other tribes and nations. Unfortunately the translator of these tales has not followed either of these courses. Not less than eighty closely printed pages of notes are appended to about three hundred pages of text, which an exact translation would have reduced to a much smaller number, and of these eighty pages not much more perhaps than a tenth is really needed to make the text intelligible to children. The collection of tales known as the *Siddhi-Kûr* is preceded by a dedication to the teacher Nagarguna, who is said to be second only to Sakyamouni. This gives occasion to one note of sixteen pages on the history of Gautama Buddha and his doctrines, and to another note of about half that length on the forms which Buddhism has taken in Tibet. On this subject a few lines or a

\* *Sagas from the Far East; or, Kalmonth and Mongolian Traditional Tales. With Historical Preface and Explanatory Notes. By the Author of "Patria," &c. London: Griffiths & Farran. 1873.*

few paragraphs would amply suffice. If anything is to be said about these stories at all, what we need to be told is, how far they are Calmuck or Mongolian; and, if they did not originate with these tribes, how far they have been modified in their new home. This is a task to be done systematically; in the present work, for all practical purposes, it has not been attempted at all. Here and there the reader will find scattered through the notes a few remarks on Mongolian or Calmuck changes in Hindu stories, although in the preface he is told that they are all traceable to Indian sources, and that they have "received an entire transformation in the course of their adoption by their new country." That this last assertion is far too sweeping, boys and girls who know the stories gathered by Grimm, Asbjornsen, Campbell, and many others will soon see when they find some of their favourites not much the worse for putting on a Mongolian dress. Beyond the mere fact of this borrowing or importation, the translator, it seems, has little to tell them; and what he does say is likely to mislead. In truth, they can scarcely fail to be misled when they are told that we can "trace the age of a building by its alterations and repairs, and that equally well whether these be made in a style later prevailing, utterly different from that of the original design, or in the most careful imitation of the same, for the age of the workman's hand cannot choose but write itself on whatever he chisels." The notion that we can always, or even generally, do this without documentary evidence is a mischievous delusion.

The statement that these stories may be traced to a Hindu source is followed, not by an attempt to show how Mongolians received them, but by a discussion on the meaning of the word "Indian," and on the way by which the Aryan tribes entered Hindostan. This is not wanted to enable children to understand these stories, while for students it is wholly uncalled for; but even more unfortunate is the eagerness of the translator in hunting out moral lessons for the edification of his readers. It might have been thought that at this time of day the stories should be allowed to speak for themselves. If a popular tale is too coarse, or in any way unfit to be put before the young, let it be kept from their sight; but it is purely mischievous to speak of these myths or traditions as being either composed with a purpose, or as even having a didactic element, unless we have clear evidence that this is the case. The author has already published collections of Spanish and other stories, of which he says that in telling them there was no need "to point to a moral, for the moral—i.e. some more or less remote application of the sacred and civilizing teaching of the Gospel—was of the very essence of each" (xv.) Here again we have an assertion which, as being altogether too sweeping, becomes untrue. Probably on no popular traditions has the Christian sentiment of the middle ages more clearly set its mark than on the magnificent group of legends which have gathered round the name of Arthur. Yet the very myth in which this sentiment becomes most conspicuous is in all its essential features found in a hundred or a thousand purely heathen stories. It is, of course, useless to seek for Christian teaching in these Mongolian tales; but the translator is nevertheless not to be baulked in his efforts to turn them to moral uses. They are, he says, "not ideal embodiments of the perfect motives by which people ought to be actuated, but *genre* pictures of the modes in which they commonly do act. As such, they cannot fail to contain the means of edification, though we are left to look for and discover and apply it for ourselves" (xvii.) The youngest of his readers will soon see that, for the most part, the motives which prompt the actors in these tales do not belong to common life at all, while those who are somewhat older will perhaps begin to feel that the edification extracted from them is obtained at the cost of spoiling them as stories, or of bringing the matter to a wrong issue. The thirteenth tale of the Siddhi-Kür relates the fortunes of the man who has set free from their tormentors three beasts which come to help him when he is shut up in the iron box for stealing silkstuff from the King's treasury. In this prison he is nearly choked for want of air, when suddenly a little chink appears in one corner. This was the work of the mouse whose life he had saved; and to the sentence in which this is stated the translator has appended the following portentous note:—

The Indian world of story abounds in tales in which the low notion of expecting some advantage to accrue in this life is proposed as the object and reward of good actions. Instances will doubtless occur to the reader. The *Pancha-Tantra* collection contains one in which an elephant is caught by a Khan out hunting by being driven into a deep dyke. He asks advice of a Brahman who passes that way as to how he is to extricate himself. "Now is the time," answers the Brahman, "to recall if you have ever done good to any one, and, if so, to call him to your aid." The elephant thereupon recalls that he once delivered a number of rats whom a Khan had hunted and caught and shut up in earthen jars by lifting the earthen jars with his trunk and gently breaking them. He accordingly invokes the aid of these rats, who come and gnaw away at the earth surrounding the dyke, till they have made so easy a slope of it that the elephant can walk out. Christianity fortunately proposes a higher motive for our good actions; and the experience of life would make that derived from results to be expected from gratitude a very poor one.

The experience of life scarcely shows that the good turns which a man may receive from others come for the most part from those whom he has injured, nor are we aware that Christianity forbids us to look for aid to those whom we may ourselves have been able to help. In short, this talk is twaddle, or something worse. It cannot edify, and it may lead to a false classification of popular stories. The very gist of both these tales is that the good deeds are done without any hope whatever of future recompense. To

show how little Shrikantha, who has rescued the mouse, the monkey, and the bear, expects any good to himself from his acts of mercy, he is represented as brought into trouble for stealing when, if it had been a mere matter of tit for tat, he might have invoked their aid to save him from hunger without adding to it the task of delivering him from the consequences of his theft. The translator's business, therefore, was to see, if he felt himself called upon to meddle with these matters at all, whether his elephant story was or was not only the story of Shrikantha in another form; whether the same story can or cannot be found among the popular traditions of other tribes; and, if so, which may be the oldest form, and whether they may or may not have one common source. The merest child who has read the tales will see that, whatever may be said of the elephant and the rats, the legend of Shrikantha is in this feature in precise agreement with that of Psyche aided by brute animals to perform the tasks put upon her by Aphrodite, and with that large family of Teutonic, Norse, and other stories in which the wanderer or pilgrim has certain seemingly impossible things to do—mountains of ice to scale, huge castles to throw down, or myriads of boulders to remove—in which, when their own powers are found to be useless, they are helped by bears, wolves, or foxes, by ducks, swans, eagles, ants, fishes, or ravens. If, then, this matter is to be taken in hand at all, these stories must be classified both according to the tasks to be done and the beasts which accomplish them. Why these beasts should be introduced is a question belonging to the *Zoological Mythology* of Professor Gubernatis; nor is it necessary for us to say whether Mr. Cox be or be not right when he states that under the names of these animals the old mythical language spoke of the clouds, the winds, and the light which conquers the darkness, and that the chief work enjoined in these tales—the recovery, namely, of an apple, a golden or a silver ball, or egg-shaped talisman—is the bringing back of the sun's orb. But it is obvious that in the one case we have a scientific process and a conclusion which may be accepted or rejected according to the evidence; in the other we have a mere random beating of the air. We rise, in fact, from the reading of these *Sagas from the Far East* knowing less about the share which Mongols or Calmucks had in shaping them than we learn from the single sentence in which Professor Gubernatis tells us that

the popular tales of the Tatars do not differ enough from those of the Aryans to infuse into them anything like new blood or affect in any degree their radical nature; on the contrary, the Tatar stories are the Aryan tales themselves, or at most the Hindoo ones, a little modified by a few peculiarities which are specifically of a Tatar character.

If the reader of these Eastern Sagas should desire to have an excellent analysis of most of these Siddhi-Kür and Ardschi-Bordschi tales, he will find it in the work of Professor Gubernatis. He will there also find evidence of some unfortunate slips made by the translator of these Eastern Sagas. In one of the tales Professor Gubernatis rightly says that "a man uses the horns of his dead buffalo to grub up the roots upon which he lives in exile." In the translation the buffalo is turned into a goat, and is brought back alive by the man to his own country, and there made to dig roots out of the earth for him to eat.

To speak plainly, the translator has not withstood, as he ought to have withstood, the temptation to compile a book which should give him a character for much learning. Nor is he the only offender among recent writers on mythological subjects. It is an easy matter for compilers to lay claims to superior wisdom by taking exception to the theories or conclusions of other writers as being carried too far, and then putting forth substantially the same conclusions as their own. This method is adopted in one or two passages by the translator of these Eastern Sagas, without, however, naming those who are thus censured. It is employed more ostentatiously by Mr. Fiske, who in his volume on Myths and Mythmakers takes special credit to himself for avoiding what he calls the extreme views of Mr. Cox. Yet Mr. Fiske speaks with undoubting assurance of "Odysseus warring with the impious night heroes who have endeavoured throughout ten long years or hours of darkness to seduce from her allegiance his twilight bride, the weaver of the never-finished web of violet clouds"; and he has no hesitation in saying that "in Achilles and Meleagros we see the unhappy solar hero doomed to toil for the profit of others, and to be cut off by an untimely death." We need say no more than that these views of Odysseus, Meleagros, and Achilles were first put forth by Mr. Cox, and are generally set down as among the extremest which he has put forth. It is time that writers on mythological matters, whose number seems to be rapidly growing, should learn the duty, more strictly obeyed by historians, of assigning to their proper sources all results not obtained strictly by their own researches. Their reputation for learning will not be lessened by more scrupulous care, even though it may cost them a little more time and trouble.

#### MACLEOD'S ECONOMICAL PHILOSOPHY.\*

MR. SARGANT, in an essay which we reviewed some time ago, remarked upon the unfairness of ignoring certain writers without close examination of their merits. He mentioned Mr. Macleod as a case in point. Mr. Macleod, as he remarked, had

\* *Economical Philosophy*. By Henry Dunning Macleod. London: Longmans & Co. 1872.



received very high commendation from some foreign authorities, and especially from M. Chevalier. English economists, on the other hand, seem to be in a tacit conspiracy to put him down, not by argument, but by silence. With Mr. Sargant's general principle we fully agree. Undoubtedly a gentleman who comes to us with such testimonials deserves a serious examination, though it is possible that the results of the examination may not be specially gratifying to him. Bearing this admonition in mind, we thought it our duty to read through a thick volume in which Mr. Macleod has expounded his principles, or rather has expounded some of them; for beyond the 676 pages of the present work we can see looming in the distance an indefinite vista of economical disquisition. We will not say that our attention has never flagged in the process; for, to confess the truth, it is difficult to conceive reading of a more hopelessly dreary kind. If we wished, for example, to express our conception of the deepest misery to which a human being could be exposed, we should endeavour to picture Mr. Carlyle condemned to plod through this contribution to the "dismal science." However, we have performed our task, and it has left upon our minds an impression equally compounded of weariness and a sense of the pathetic. Here is a gentleman of great reading, of much experience in business, and of some ability, who has obviously devoted years of labour to preaching a new economical gospel to mankind. He is fully persuaded that his speculations are fraught with results of unspeakable importance to human happiness. Newton did not work harder at his mathematical inquiries, nor did Descartes show more devotion to metaphysics, than Mr. Macleod to what he calls "Economic Philosophy." Is it not rather cruel to say to such a man, Your pains have been thrown away; you have found nothing but a mare's nest, and your philosophy is chiefly composed of rubbish? And yet what is a critic to do if such should be his candid opinion? He must, we presume, speak the truth, and, whilst praising Mr. Macleod's heroic devotion to his task, admit with sadness that his book is one more lamentable waste of human energy. Well, waste is the law of nature, and we cannot be much surprised. Mr. Macleod has done his best; he has accumulated a considerable amount of information which may be useful in other hands; he has done some positive service to literary history in calling attention to the labours of the French and Italian economists who anticipated Adam Smith in many of the doctrines which are supposed to have started full-blown from the Scotchman's brains; and he has published a very big book. More we can hardly say for him; the remarks which we are about to make will be to Mr. Macleod one more instance of the perverse stupidity which fails to recognize his merits; whilst to Mr. Sargant they may possibly serve in some degree to justify the apparent negligence of English economists in ignoring the claims of this would-be reformer of the science. In fact, we began to read Mr. Macleod with as much impartiality as was possible; but we soon came upon a specimen or two of his methods of reasoning which would probably deter any one but a critic from going much further.

Mr. Macleod, for example, argues at starting that the same methods are applicable to the moral and to the natural sciences. Amongst other authorities rather more to the point, he quotes Bishop Butler as holding this theory; and alleges in proof Butler's well-known sentence, "There is much more exact correspondence between the natural and the moral world than we are apt to take notice of." We will not say that the remark is utterly irrelevant; but when we see Butler classed with Bacon, Locke, Say, Comte, and Mill, as maintaining that "economic science as one of the moral sciences is an inductive science," and so classed on the strength of this single saying, we are struck with amazement. We have no doubt that Butler would have been equally amazed at being dragged into a controversy so utterly foreign to his modes of thought. Going a little further, we are still more perplexed by Mr. Macleod's notion of what is meant by inductive science. Mr. Mill alleges as a reason for teaching political economy by deductive rather than by inductive methods that we cannot try experiments in it. We cannot, as he puts it, "try forms of government and systems of national policy on a small scale in our laboratories." Now Mr. Macleod admits the truth of the statement, as he could not very well deny it; but he denies that it renders inductive methods inapplicable. His reason is singular. "In political economy," he says, "and the moral sciences generally, we can have what are in all respects equivalent to experiments—namely, FEIGNED CASES. . . . We can argue from feigned cases, and deduce principles from them with exactly the same degree of certainty as if they were real cases; and also with the same degree of certainty as principles are tested by real experiments in experimental science." He proceeds to invent the name of "experiential philosophy" for "that branch of inductive science whose axioms are tested by observation and feigned cases or human experience." The *naïveté* of this argument is admirable. A "feigned case" means that you find out what would be the result of certain combinations by reasoning instead of by appealing to experience. Inductive reasoning rests upon inquiry into cases which have been observed. Deductive reasoning means inquiring into cases which have not happened, or, as Mr. Macleod calls them, feigned cases. And thus he argues that the moral sciences are inductive because they use deductive methods. He regards this as a great discovery.

When we meet with such an argument we have a pretty

shrewd guess as to the logical capacity of the author. Mr. Macleod, however, presents us with other samples of argument almost equally strange. He has, as may easily be imagined, a great objection to Mr. Mill's methods of reasoning. Mr. Mill tells us in a well-known passage that it is improper to speak of the price of any commodity being fixed by the ratio between the demand and the supply. "The idea of a ratio," he says, "as between demand and supply is out of place, and has no concern in the matter; the proper mathematical analogy is that of an equation." Hereupon Mr. Macleod triumphs greatly. "It is very surprising," he says, "that so acute a thinker should not have perceived what any intelligent schoolboy could have told him, that an equation is a ratio!" We have every reason to believe that Mr. Mill is a gentleman of singularly humane temper, and entirely averse to the needless infliction of corporal punishment. We therefore imagine that if a schoolboy had made such a statement to him, he would have calmly explained the error involved. A ratio, we need hardly say, is no more an equation than a triangle is a geometrical axiom. The relation of two to three is a ratio; the statement  $2x=3y$  is an equation; and there is therefore a most important difference between saying that price depends upon the ratio between demand and supply, and saying that it is determined by an equation between demand and supply. The point is not of much importance, except as illustrating Mr. Macleod's lax use of language, especially as he condescends to acknowledge that Mr. Mill "gives fairly enough an account how demand and supply are adjusted." Similar confusions appear at every page. Here is another problem for the "intelligent schoolboy." Mr. Macleod tells us that every book on algebra says, as an illustration of the meaning of positive and negative signs, that "money is a positive quantity, and that a debt is a negative quantity." To talk about money being positive is just as meaningless as to talk about horses or oxen being positive. If you are calculating the amount of a man's property, you may, if you please, call the number of coins owing to him positive, and you must then call the number which he owes negative. And therefore one may say roughly that credit may be called positive and debt negative. Mr. Macleod, however, makes a great point of what he calls negative economic quantities, which he appears to regard as mysterious entities endowed with some strange intrinsic quality. He gets into terrible troubles with his negative sign, and still more with the imaginary symbol  $\sqrt{-1}$ , and reminds us at times of an unfortunate wrangler who dreamt that he had got under a square root with a negative sign prefixed to him, and that all the best mathematicians in Europe were in vain endeavouring to extract him. Over 5,000,000,000 of debts or credits, he says, pass through the London Clearing House in a year. "Now in those great accounts," he asks pathetically, "consisting chiefly of negative quantities, what are they to be subtracted from?" We will say, to relieve his mind, that he need not call them negative unless he chooses, and, further, that there is no law, human or divine, which bids him to subtract them from anything. If, indeed, he wishes to determine the total amount of credit or indebtedness of any class, he had better subtract the debts from the credits, and as all these distressing negative quantities represent debts due from somebody to somebody else, he will find that, if he includes all classes, the result is precisely nothing.

Here, however, we come across Mr. Macleod's favourite doctrine, upon which he has expended an infinite amount of labour, and which is to revolutionize the science. The confusions into which he falls are curious as illustrating a particular weakness of the human mind, but are otherwise scarcely worth prolonged study. His main argument, as we take it, is as follows:—He defines wealth to be anything exchangeable. Hence it follows that a good many things are wealth which are not generally known under that name. This will appear from his classification of wealth into "corporeal property," "unmaterial property," and "incorporeal property." Typical examples of the three classes are land, money, or minerals in the first, labour of all kinds in the second, and credit or copyrights in the third class. Mr. Macleod has of course a right to define his terms as he pleases, and we cannot complain so long as he is consistent, though we may doubt whether his definition is the most convenient. There has been much dispute as to whether personal accomplishments, for example, should be called wealth; and though we should agree with Mr. Mill in excluding them, there is no necessary absurdity in giving them that name. We must remark, however, that Mr. Macleod's definition involves an obvious inconsistency. To call an ox wealth, and to call credit wealth, is to compare things essentially disparate. At times, too, Mr. Macleod himself uses words differently. Wealth sometimes means with him, not the ox, but the right to the ox; and these are very different things, though Mr. Macleod apparently confounds them. The right to an ox may, in fact, be compared with the right to a sum of money, which can hardly be said for the ox itself. If then by wealth be meant merely rights, it is obvious enough that they may be multiplied at will to any assignable extent. The consequence, however, is a divergence from ordinary speech which is, to say the least, perplexing. If A. promises to pay B. 1,000*l.*, and B. promises to pay the same sum to A., Mr. Macleod considers that the wealth of the country is increased by 2,000*l.* And thus, without a single addition to the material wealth of a country, its wealth, as Mr. Macleod uses the word, may vary indefinitely. Mr. Macleod, again, declares that "credit is capital," and that "money

is a general right"—expressions which, according to the ordinary use of words, involve a palpable confusion of ideas. To call a sovereign a right is to bring all language into incalculable entanglement. Without, however, tracing Mr. Macleod's argument in detail, we will simply suggest to him that, if his nomenclature is accepted, he must invent some new word to signify what is now generally meant by wealth. If he does not admit of such a new word he will fall into the strangest perplexities. When a house is called wealth, and the right to the lease is also wealth, we are left without the power of distinguishing between a concrete reality and a metaphysical abstraction. If, on the other hand, Mr. Macleod admits such a term, all the previous doctrines of the ordinary school will remain unchanged, except verbally. The difference remains in spite of all Mr. Macleod's fine language about the "continuity of science" and the necessity of finding a "general form or cause of value," and studiously ignoring the difficulty is only to plunge into constant confusion.

It is needless, even if we had the space, to consider Mr. Macleod's assault upon Ricardo's doctrines of the conformity of price to the cost of production, and the law of rent. Probably they will not disturb the faith of any orthodox political economist. One remark we may venture to make. Mr. Macleod tells us that it is highly unphilosophical to break up phenomena into classes, and to say that value is determined in one case by supply and demand, and in another by the cost of production. It is like explaining some planetary motions by the Ptolemaic and another by the Copernican hypothesis. But if facts persist upon being affected by different laws, as all concrete facts do, what is the use of an *a priori* objection, especially in the mouth of an inductive philosopher? Would Mr. Macleod say that it was unphilosophical to bring different laws to account for the motion of a body in *vacuo* and in a resisting medium? That Ricardo used some inconsistent language in speaking of labour as the cause of value we freely grant; and we agree further with the grand philosophical doctrine that demand is in all cases the cause of value, which means simply that people always buy a thing because, for some reason or other, they want it. But it remains true that the value of commodities will follow different laws of variation according as they are or are not the subject of a monopoly. Labour, as Mr. Macleod seems half to admit, may regulate value in some cases, though we may not call it, in some senses, the cause of value. A fair analogy would seem to be this:—If we wished to know the precise pressure in the boiler of a steam-engine, we might say that it was determined by the weight on the safety-valve. No, says Mr. Macleod, that is utterly unphilosophical. It is determined by the temperature and density of the vapour. That is also quite true; but then the condition of the vapour is determined by the safety-valve. And, in like manner, Ricardo's theory that value depends on the cost of production is perfectly accurate as determining what will be the price of commodities, although acute philosophers may declare that he is describing, not the cause, but an essential condition. In short, we fear that, though Mr. Macleod energetically denies it, he is in fact indulging in a mere logomachy when he is not positively erroneous.

#### JOHANNES OLAF.\*

**JOHANNES OLAF**, so far as we know, is the first novel by this authoress which has yet appeared in England. She may or she may not have published other books in Germany. If she has, the various catalogues that we have been able to consult have omitted to mention them. Her English publishers, however, have thought fit to advertise *Johannes Olaf* as by "the George Eliot of Germany," and by so doing they have probably attracted some readers to a book which otherwise might have remained unread. But such an announcement, while it arouses curiosity, suggests comparison; and when a comparison is instituted between Madame de Wille and George Eliot, it may be doubtful if the former comes well out of it. It would have been a pleasing mission to direct attention to a new author whose novels would rank with *Romola* or *Silas Marner*. *Middlemarch* had come to an end just as *Johannes Olaf* was announced, and there was no prospect that the English George Eliot would write again for months. But here was the German George Eliot ready to fill up the gap until the native product could again be produced in those much looked-for monthly or quarterly supplies. Interest might be excited by the reproduction of German middle-class life as much as it had been by those familiar pictures of English middle-class life. A German or Icelandic Dorothea might arouse speculation as to minute points of individual character as readily as an English Dorothea. Conversation in everyday society might ring the changes on the plot and texture of Madame de Wille's German novel with the same animation and enthusiasm that it exhibited during eighteen months on the plot and texture of George Eliot's great English novel. How much better it would be to have two George Eliots than one! The fountain of her genius would thus be perennial, and English and German novel readers might drink thereof perpetually.

The first half-dozen pages of *Johannes Olaf* encouraged rather than otherwise these sanguine anticipations. They promised to be the

prelude of a grand, wild Northern romance; and wild and Northern the romance truly proved to be. But before half of the first volume was concluded all feeling of grandeur died away, and the vision of a new George Eliot having arisen amongst us disappeared. The book is wild, as we have said, and continues getting wilder and wilder as it unfolds, until it culminates in incoherence. It begins with a few pithy and striking sentences that awaken a transient interest. But these soon give way to what the book really is—a prolix and unconnected record of the ungoverned impulses of a Scandinavian savage, portrayed by Madame de Wille with a sort of discordant force which has much the same resemblance to the intellectual elements which constitute the genius of George Eliot as the jingling rattle of tin plates behind the scenes in a provincial theatre has to the sound of thunder.

The novel, if it can be called a novel, is badly written and indifferently translated. The writing has all the usual peculiarities of bad German composition—lengthy unmeaning sentences crowded with epithets in the superlative degree strung together without precision or directness, and weary monologues instead of conversations without a broken paragraph for pages. The translation bears the name of F. E. Bunnnett. If this be the translator of Gervinus's *Shakespeare*, his familiarity with the English idiom has not increased in the last ten years. It is difficult to understand how a writer who has such command of English as that translator certainly has could have habitually misused the word "than" when he intended to say "except," as in the sentence "He saw nothing in the world *than* what invited raillery and satire," or could have suffered the following to pass into the hands of people who think they are going to read the English language:—"It is repugnant to me that one man should dare to mark out the path of another; the watchmaker, who with the key of his understanding, presumes to set going and to regulate the mechanism of the nature within—no weary satiated heart shall interpret the dreams of my youth." It is true that the author says in one place, "Poetry is the language of some of us"; and this that we have quoted may be poetry. It certainly is not prose, or at least English prose, in the ordinary acceptance of the term.

The story is divided, after the German fashion, into a series of books, nine of them altogether, each divided into a series of chapters. In every book of the series Johannes appears in a different character—s a badly nurtured boy, a gloomy student, a social sinner, and a gay Lothario, a murderer, a convict, a pirate, an explorer, a naturalist, a man about town, a good physician, and a constructive, if not an actual, infringer of the Seventh Commandment. In each character his native ferocity is unduly prominent, and, fearing neither God nor man, he runs through the whole gamut of his performances in defiance of all law, all religion, all reasonable conduct, but with an indeterminate straining after something which he considers the higher law, but which, fortunately for weak humanity, is not yet recognized anywhere except in the ill-defined imaginings of brooding novelists, mostly of the softer sex. Johannes Olaf is the son of a schoolmaster in the island of Föhr (which, for the benefit of the inexperienced, we may explain is in the North Sea, on the western coast of Schleswig), by his wife Goneril. "Goneril's," we are told, "was a passionate nature, which consumed itself inwardly. . . . People said that she loved nothing rightly, not even her own son." The explanation of this idiosyncrasy in Goneril's character is found in her genealogy, which, as being peculiar, we prefer to give in the "German George Eliot's" own words:—

Goneril was a child of love. Her mother, the wife of the brave Jan Ketel, had forgotten her conjugal fidelity for the sake of a stranger who had been shipwrecked on the island, and who, after a short sojourn there, had departed, never more to return. The name of the stranger was Adam Thorson; his home was Iceland. No one knew more of him than this, not even the woman who for his sake had imperilled both soul and body. But his unusual appearance had remained like a legend on the lips of the people; and as Goneril grew up and became more beautiful than her brothers and sisters, and utterly diverse from them, her mother, whose heavy sin had been forgiven by her husband, told her, with secret tears, of Adam Thorson, and Goneril felt herself among her brothers and sisters like the royal child in the fairy tale, who, conscious of her noble descent, assumes the bearing of a lofty spirit as a jewel from the ancestral crown. Endowed by nature with a kind of wild poetic feeling, she loved the sea as though it were her father's kingdom and her own natural home.

After the death of Goneril and her schoolmaster—the latter having expired under the effort of painting a picture of Eve which so shocked the royal Goneril that she sewed it up in a modest covering—Johannes is taken up by Thorson, his maternal grandfather, and after spending some time in Iceland, is sent to sea while Thorson retires to "the monastery on the island of Iona"; the author, in defiance of all historical or antiquarian lore, proudly ignoring the fact that there has been no monastery on Iona—unless a piece of whitewashed Presbyterian Church architecture, recently erected, can be dignified by the name of a monastery—since the end of the fifteenth century. Johannes next appears living at Hamburg as a student in the same house with Franziska Warning and her mother. Franziska falls in love with Johannes, or, as the author puts it, "her fresh vigorous nature was gone, and in his presence she had become fettered in soul and body and trembling like a string too tightly drawn." For a time Johannes reciprocated this feeling; "there was something in her that calmed him and made him happy"; but he falls into evil ways. He meets a beautiful waif and transfers his grand emotions to her. They set up house together, and "days, weeks,

\* *Johannes Olaf*. By Elizabeth de Wille. Translated from the German by F. E. Bunnnett. 3 vols. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1873.



and months passed away as in an intoxicating ecstasy of happiness." There were difficulties in the way of marriage; papers and certificates had to be procured; great expense was connected with the settlements. "He himself," it appears, "regarded the nuptial ceremony with indifference; what else than indifferent was it in the earnestness of his love? Maria (i.e. the wife) also would hear no more of it. 'No, no; it cost money,' and must they not save, and spare? She agreed with him as he did with her, and she called herself by his name." This ideal existence ended in the usual way. Johannes had to leave his Maria for a fortnight, and on his return she had disappeared. After days and nights spent in fruitless searching after her she is traced to the suburban villa of a youthful noble. Johannes in despair, but resolute, borrows a pistol from a college friend and shoots the youthful noble through the head in his own villa and almost in Maria's arms. He is imprisoned, and Franziska reappears upon the scene. She, *more Germanico*, discusses the ethics of love and murder with her music-master, defends Johannes' act as that of a noble-hearted man whose "blood is hot," and, heedless of her music-master's warnings, squanders her fortune and ruins herself and her widowed mother in bribing a treacherous gaoler to let Johannes make his escape. By good or bad luck she at length succeeds. A great fire broke out in the prison; the gaoler leaves the door of Johannes' cell open; he seizes the opportunity, escapes into the main sewer of Hamburg, and finally gets on board a sailing vessel, which combines the characters of a smuggler, a wrecker, and a pirate. There, after moralizing on his past life in the following strain, he is thrown overboard and picked up by an English yacht:—

His heart rebelled, his blood surged within him with the old defiant feeling, when he had to join in the penitential psalms and litanies which were placed before him. "I have not yet been brought down so low in soul and body," he would say, "that I should have defiled my innermost shrine; rolling the eyes, lamentations, and genuflections are not in my way, least of all when they are the result of habit or intended not to give offence. What are the concerns of one soul to another? Each has his feelings—the god or the devil he obeys. None has the rule here, and has a right to enter by force." The clergyman had turned aside, because Johannes looked upon his wild act as the soldier does upon the foe whom he has slain! One feeling, however, was within him, and that lay deep as life. Maria was lost, so young, so beautiful; who now trampled upon her fate? Who was destroying her soul? How often did he fearfully and shudderingly look at one of the female prisoners immured there, he knew not why. She had been beautiful, like Maria; now she was depraved, immodest, ruined! And was he to have pity and to feel repentance because he had killed one who had broken into the sanctuary of his happiness, to make his consecrated image a disgrace and a dishonour? What to him was the law of a world which tolerates every domestic outrage, which declares to him, with a thousand miserable examples, that that woman was not worth the powder he expended in her behalf! Blood for blood! Had he not also perished? His youth, his mind, his honour, freedom, happiness! And was he to atone for his deed, and to wash his blood-red heart white with tears of repentance? The milk of human mercy was not for him. Who had spared him? Who had regarded him? "Farewell, happiness! Thou and I are to know each other no more. That is atonement and expiation enough!"

Johannes was raised to excitement by the feelings which stirred within him! He seized the oar hastily, and plunged it in the water.

Both took the oars; not a breath moved; the morning was cold; the keen air did Johannes good. He drank nearly a bottle of rum. He was glad they were obliged to row so hard, in order to reach home, that their joints cracked and the perspiration ran down their bodies.

After this exciting episode, which brings us down only to the beginning of Book V. of this eventful life—and there are four more to come—it may be unnecessary to proceed further with the tedious and disagreeable narrative. If any of our readers feel stimulated to pursue the wanderings of Johannes, we must refer them to the work itself. There are still nearly two volumes left, and the hero has to appear in some fifteen different characters before you come to the end of him. It is only fair to the authoress to leave part of her tale untold. But before parting with her we would, with all courtesy, suggest one remark for her consideration. If she wishes to become popular in England, she must adapt herself to English taste; and English taste is not fastidious, nor is it unreasonably prudish. But it is easily bored, and it can be shocked. It wants in a novel something light and delicate, if it cannot get something of genuine force and power. It wants something natural, pleasant, and readable, and it has a prejudice—it may be an insular prejudice—in favour of works of fiction which may be discussed in general society by people of both sexes who do not "regard the nuptial ceremony with indifference" and are still in ignorance of "the higher law."

#### THE FRENCH INDO-CHINESE EXPEDITION.\*

THE official report of the expedition up the Cambodia river, of which we spoke in our recent notice of M. de Carné's work, has lately issued from the press of Messrs. Hachette. Nothing in the way of literary taste or finish could excel the getting up of these two large and handsome volumes. Paper and type of superlative quality; woodcuts, combining boldness and breadth with delicacy and clearness of detail, not less than two hundred and fifty in number; architectural plans, and facsimiles of native inscriptions or manuscripts,

\* *Voyage d'Exploration en Indo-Chine*, effectué pendant les années 1866, 1867, et 1868, par une commission française, présidée par M. le capitaine de frégate Doudart de Lagrée, et publié par les ordres du ministre de la Marine, sous la direction de M. le lieutenant de vaisseau Francis Garnier. 2 vols. folio. Paris: Hachette & Co. 1873.

bespeak at once the liberality of the Government under whose auspices the work has been prepared, and the taste and skill which have been brought to the execution of the task. The literary care of the report has devolved since the death of the lamented chief of the expedition, M. Lagrée, upon M. Francis Garnier, the able hydrographer to the mission, aided by Lieutenant Delaporte and Drs. Joubert and Thorel, who were attached to it partly in a medical capacity, partly for the purposes of scientific exploration and research. It is to the pencil of M. Delaporte that we owe the sketches from which have been prepared the woodcuts that so graphically illustrate the text, as well as the drawings and plans on a larger scale, chiefly lithographs and in colours, which make up the *Album pittoresque*, in folio, corresponding in size with Lieutenant Garnier's atlas of charts and geographic details. The first volume of the work is occupied with the history of the mission, preceded by a sketch of its objects and equipments; the formal instructions given to M. Lagrée by the French Governor at Saigon, Admiral de la Grandière; the *personnel* of the commission; the credentials supplied by the Siamese Minister at Bangkok for the Northern provinces and the Mekong, Chao Phya Bhudhara Bhay, by whom letters commendatory were also given for the purpose of securing similar passports from the Courts of Hué, Peking, and Ava.

On the 5th of June, 1866, the party started from Saigon. So little being popularly known of the previous explorations of this region, M. Garnier has thought it well to introduce his narrative with an historical summary of geographical discoveries in the Indo-Chinese peninsula. The meeting-point and battle-ground of the two oldest races or civilizations in the world, there is hardly any district of which the earliest records are buried in deeper obscurity. Indo-China was the latest among Oriental lands to become known to Europeans. The impulse given to Western enterprise by the conquests of Alexander, after having driven back the limits of the unknown world from the Indus to the Ganges, seems to have had no power to urge Europeans across the latter river. On the other hand, the extension and consolidation of Chinese power as far westwards as the Oxus and the Jaxartes, in the second century before our era, had created to the north of the Himalayan chain an important commercial current, which opened to India and China a direct line of communication, too far to the north for the existence of Indo-China even to be suspected. Owing to the constant strife between the two races, after the mission of General Tchang-Kiang to the trans-Oxian provinces, an expedition was at length despatched in the year 122 B.C. by the Emperor Hiao-wou-ti to seek by a southerly route to reach the land of Chin-thou (the region of the Indus). Having reached the Tien country, the present province of Yunnan, and having been detained for four years by the artifices of the King, the mission returned home without result. It was not till two centuries later that the communications by the upper regions of Indo-China became more frequent, according to the authorities consulted by M. Garnier. This was due in the main to the spread of Buddhism, which reached as far as China about the year 61 A.D., and rapidly gained ground for itself in Indo-China. It is not long after this that the Chinese annals speak of the people of Fa-thsin, the Roman Empire, coming for purposes of trade to the kingdoms of Fou-nan, Ji-nan, Kiao, Tchi—that is, to the upper provinces of Indo-China—and the kings of India sending tribute and ambassadors "outside the frontiers of Ji-nan." This route, our author, resting on the words thus quoted, believes to have been that followed by the envoys of M. Aurelius in the year 166, in preference to the view of many Orientalists that the Roman mission landed at Canton, which they identify with the Cattigara of Ptolemy. Gosselin, he adds, places Cattigara on the west coast of the peninsula of Malacca, at the mouth of the Jenasserim river. In 227 the native historians speak of the arrival of a Roman, whom they name Lun, at Kiao-tchi (Tong-kin), whence he proceeded to the Court of the King of Ou (Southern China). About the same date mention is first made of the maritime relations of the powerful Empire of Fou-nan with India. How soon the use of the compass and the knowledge of the monsoons may have led to a regular traffic on the part of the Chinese mariners with the ports of Hindostan it may be impossible to discover; but early in the fifth century, according to Massoudi, quoted by our author, their junks appeared in numbers in the Persian Gulf; and although the Buddhist pilgrims, as a rule, kept to the northern or overland route, one of their number, the celebrated Fa-hien, after making his journey westward by that route to Hindostan, embarked at the mouth of the Ganges, and made his way home by coasting round the Indo-Chinese peninsula. M. Garnier is chary of naming his authorities, especially the source from which he has drawn his stores of early Oriental lore. Had he let us more intimately into his confidence, we can imagine him owing to many an obligation, not only to Pauthier, Klaproth, and De Rémusat, with other collectors and interpreters of the Chinese annals and Arabic historians, but, among writers of our own country, to Colonel Yule, who has brought together such a mass of reading of this class in *Cathay, and the Way thither*. At the same time he may claim to have in no slight measure repaid such obligation by the valuable notes for which Colonel Yule acknowledges himself indebted to the courteous and liberal communications of the French officer, imparting, as they have done, not a little of its exactitude and finish to this part of his admirable edition of *Polo*. From whatever source derived, M. Garnier's historical summary presents in

a clear and masterly manner the utmost that can be done, out of existing materials, to set forth in a connected form the course of discovery in this direction.

By the eighth century it seems clear that all the coasts of the peninsula were freely frequented by Western navigators. In 758 so numerous were the Arabs and Persians at Khan-fou, which our author would identify with the Gan-pou of Marco Polo, as to break out into a revolt. The effect of the troubles which led to the downfall of the Thang dynasty, towards the end of the ninth century, was to draw away the commerce of China towards the isles of Sonda and the great rivers of Indo-China. In the course of the closer relations between China and Hindostan which grew out of the conquests of Mohammed of Ghuznee, took place the voyages of Ibn Batoutah, between 1342 and 1349, which furnish many particulars concerning the peninsula. More than half a century before this Polo had penetrated the northern part of this region, traversing a portion of Yunnan, Burmah, and the intermediate provinces. To what extent he penetrated into the heart of the peninsula depends upon two points—how far we are to take his descriptions to imply his visitation of each spot in person, and how far we are at liberty to identify such places as he mentions with Indo-Chinese names. We may probably take it, with Colonel Yule, to be quite made out that Polo's Carujan is the city of Tali-fu visited by the French expedition—whether or not, with Pauthier, we conceive the Caugigu of the Venetian traveller to be one of the Laotian States, that of Papesifu, as Colonel Yule thinks, to the north-east of which lay Cuiju, now Kwei-chau, or Kiang-Hung. Derived as they doubtless were in the main from native rumour, there is not much light that Polo's itineraries can be made to throw upon the topography or the political condition of Laos in the middle period of its history, before we come to the better authenticated records of exploration and travel which followed the discovery of the Cape route to the East. The voyages of the Genoese and Venetians, followed by the Portuguese, bring the country into fixed and well-ascertained relations with the general course of history. The French brothers Parmentier, who made two voyages to India and China about 1525 and 1529, do not appear to have landed on any point of the region of Asia that concerns us. But in 1565 the Spaniards, having taken possession of the Philippines, spread into Indo-China. The first Europeans to penetrate and to make known the kingdom of Laos were the Spanish adventurers Blas Ruiz and Diego Beloso in 1596, though thirty years before this the Dominican Alonso Ximenes had played a conspicuous part at the Court of Apramlangara, King of Cambodia, who had solicited the aid of Spaniards against a revolting nephew. In the account of this war by Ribadeneyra and Cristoval de Jaque we have the earliest mention of the wondrous ruins of Angkor, discovered in 1570. So confused was still the geography of that region, that Jaque could speak of the kingdoms of Cambodia, Pegu, and Rachon (Arracan) being watered by a branch of the Ganges. In 1596 the Dutch made their appearance on the Indo-Chinese seaboard, followed by the English, the first English factory being founded by Henry Middleton, in 1610, at Ajuthia. In the course of trade disputes which ensued a massacre of Dutch and English took place in Cochin-China in 1619. Gerard van Wusthof, despatched by the Dutch Company in 1641, who ascended the Mekong as far as Vian-Chang, the Laotian capital, left few geographical notes. It was the Jesuit Jean-Marie Leria, who resided there several years, to whom we owe fuller notices of that country, reduced to order and published by Martini, incorrect as they are in many points of geography. The intermediate growth of knowledge down to our own time is to be traced in such compilations as those of Pauthier, De Rémusat, and Stanislas Julien, with the journals and notices of McLeod, Yule, and other officers or travellers of our own, the notes of the lamented Henri Mouhot, and the elaborate work of Dr. Bastian, opening up within the last twelve years newer and more intimate views of Laos and its people, and the remains of its ancient grandeur. The volumes now before us present in a collective and authentic form the sum of all that has come down from the past, or that is to be gathered on the spot, concerning this deeply interesting region of the Asiatic continent.

The personal narrative of the expedition, which takes up the remainder of the first volume, has already been in a measure brought before us in M. de Carné's lively sketches. Told here in fuller detail, and made vivid by the illustrations profusely interspersed among its pages, it forms a record of travel to which we should find it very difficult to do full justice. To a taste for the picturesque in nature, and a feeling both warm and appreciative for all that belongs to human life and manners, M. Garnier adds the culture of a well-read student of history, and the critical eye of a skilled archaeologist. The volume closes with an ably written *précis* or history of the recent progress of French diplomacy in Cochin-China, with a justification of the political and commercial designs out of which the late expedition grew. Other causes than the death of its official leader have to be taken into account in explaining the slowness of the political results which it is calculated to bring directly to the influence of France in the heart of the peninsula, or to the development of commerce or of European civilization on the overland route towards China. In the interests of science much has been done towards accurately laying down the geographical and geological features of the Mekong valley and the neighbouring districts, mapping the course of the stream and its tributaries, with the aid of numerous stations astronomically determined, and collecting data for estimating the mineral and agricultural resources of the country.

A series of carefully written reports under these respective heads makes up the bulk of the second volume, chiefly from the pens of Drs. Joubert and Thorel. Philologists will be pleased with a list of Laotian, Siamese, Cambodian, and other words, prepared in part by the late M. Lagrée, together with much critical discussion of the comparative structure and affinities of the native tongues. The ethnology of the peninsula is elucidated by means of a series of native heads in chromo-lithography, based, we presume, upon photographs, full of individuality as well as of the typical characteristics of Eastern races. The part which M. Garnier has had specially for his own—namely, the chartography of the line of route—is executed with all the clearness, precision, and delicacy which we naturally look for from the hydrographic department of our neighbours. The sectional surveys of the Mekong, with the bearings and cross-sections which determine the set and the altitude of the land on either side, leave nothing for future map-makers but to copy and incorporate. Where the work falls short of what many had been encouraged to expect is in a matter which in no way detracts from the proper credit of the surveyor. Beyond the point whence the expedition had to turn back, all had necessarily to be left in the same state of conjecture as before. Downwards indeed to the sea, from the point where M. Garnier and his party quitted the Mekong (lat. 22° N.), just above Kiang-Hong, the course of the river has been laid down with true geographical precision. But our author's maps add nothing to what little was previously known of the upper waters of this great river. He can but lay down the same traditional or conjectural landmarks. He has, indeed, fixed for us the true position of Lake Tali, its elevation (2,120 metres) above the sea, and its affluent, the Yang-pi-Kiang, whereby its waters mingle with those of the Mekong, there and for a great portion of its upper course known as the Lan-tsang. But it is reserved for future explorers to penetrate and solve the mystery which has been kept from the dawn of geological time by the vast and lofty range of the Thibetan Alps, from whose mighty glaciers issue by unknown gorges the five great rivers of Eastern Asia—the Brahmapootra to the west and south-west, the Yang-tse to the east and south-east, the Irrawaddy, Salween, and Mekong to the south. M. Garnier's two comparative charts, the one representing the state of Indo-Chinese geography before, the other since, the French expedition, show how much has been done to fill up the gaps in the river's course, notably the long bend between Luang-Prabang and Kiang-Hong, as well as the vast blank formerly existing between the latter point and Yunnan. Greatly enhanced accuracy and definition have also been given to the rivers and mountain chains which were crossed or sighted on the journey over the Chinese upland from Yunnan to where the Yang-tse was struck at Sou-Tchou-fu.

But that which, beyond all contributions to geographical or other science, will be held to form the glory or charm of the work is the artistic presentment, on a scale and with a degree of pictorial truth never seen before, of the architectural monuments of Indo-China. Those true wonders of the world, the ruined memorials of the noble Kmer builders of old, attest a degree of civilization, a culture of art, an accumulation of wealth, and an organized command of labour, on which we gaze with a wonder not inferior to that inspired by the disinterred palaces and temples of Assyria. The most important of these structures, already made known to us by Mouhot and Bastian, have been once more accurately drawn, to the scale of 1 to 1,000, by M. Delaporte, whose larger drawings, engraved with the utmost boldness and depth possible in wood, give admirable perspective views of these elaborate and stately piles. Conspicuous above all are the ruins of the great Buddhist pagoda palace of Angkor. Not much under an English mile in its longest dimensions, this mighty parallelogram, nearly square, exhibits a series of terraces of the same form, above which rises in the centre the great "Angkor wat" (pagoda), with its five towers, the central one some hundred and eighty feet in height. Amazing richness of detail characterizes the carving of the galleries or cloisters which surround the building, the passages or corridors from stage to stage, the doorways, cornices, and, in fact, every portion over which the workman's hand has passed. Over the façade of the Baion, or monument with forty-two towers, part of the "Angkor Thom" (great palace), gigantic Bouddhas sit in array amid groups of elephants, serpents, and various animals of stone. Unique probably among architectural devices of its class is the giant's causeway at the south entrance, of which a restoration has been attempted from the fragments which remain *in situ*. A long row of fifty-six gigantic kneeling figures on either side of the approach, wearing the royal cap of Burmese type, sustain under their arms a beam of stone extending the entire length of the array, ending with the nine-headed serpent, the heads disposed in fan-shape. At the east gate a grotesque human figure with nine heads sits on watch. On the east the cornice is upheld by a curious row of caryatides—human trunks with outspread and uplifted arms, ending in bodies of yaks below. In the interior, bas-reliefs of striking power and beauty abound—here a file of dancing women, marvellous for vivacity and grace; there an array of kings in their chariots, with sword and shield, cleaving their way through throngs of followers of lesser stature, recalling to mind the mural tablets of Nineveh or Egypt. The pillars and cornices are marked throughout by a distinctively Doric style of ornamentation, showing that Western influences mingled with the native arts which accompanied the Buddhist migration from India to the peninsula. How long these



monuments of a now decayed civilization had been reared prior to their devastation by the Siamese invaders about the sixteenth century appears to remain uncertain. Signs are to be seen that ruin had set in in parts even whilst other parts were under the eye and hand of the architect. Whatever their date and history, they have beyond denial opened up a long untorn page in the development of art and of human progress in general, and the style in which they are set forth in M. Garnier's pages gives its crowning finish to a work which forms in most respects one of the literary triumphs of the day.

#### THE FOOL OF QUALITY.\*

IT will be an achievement of which even Mr. Kingsley may be proud if he succeeds at last in bringing the *Fool of Quality* into fashion. His preface to the present edition was written many years ago, a fact only noteworthy as proving that his opinion of the work is the deliberate opinion of a life, and that his contempt for a reading public which neglects so remarkable a genius is not mitigated by time. We respect a courage which can set its own judgment against fearful odds, but at the same time we are driven to search for some reason for Mr. Kingsley's preference outside the merits of the book, and we imagine that we find it in gratitude. It must have been the first book Mr. Kingsley ever read. The first book which makes us think, or opens a new world to our fancy, entails an everlasting sense of obligation. It is often chance rather than merit that effects this awakening. The keener the intelligence the lighter the touch needed; but there might be a peculiar fitness in the *Fool of Quality* to give the first impulse to Mr. Kingsley's dawning faculty of invention, for its hero foreshadows the Muscular Christianity with which he has made the world familiar. When we say that to the ordinary reader the *Fool of Quality* as a whole is an absolutely unreadable book, or so far unreadable that only a reviewer's sense of duty can force him through the task, we are very far from saying that it wants merit. There is truth and independent thought in the dissertations, and there is a great deal of the author's self in it. We admit that it may have told in its day, coming out a volume at a time; the idea of *Sandford and Merton* was probably taken from it. But there is a gigantic childishness running through it and gaining head over everything else as the story advances, which not only wearies the reader, but makes him ashamed. The story swamps the theories and reflections on which Mr. Kingsley lays such great stress; the illustration goes far to render the principles of action ridiculous. It is impossible that the mind which expatiated in such absurdities could ever have arrived at maturity.

Not a great deal is known of the author, Henry Brooke, but what is told us bears out this view. He was a precocious child; he was something of a genius, but he was never in the full strong sense of the word a man; he was, however, a personage in his day. He was born in 1708; his father was a wealthy, worthy parson in County Cavan; his mother was known, and even held in some awe, by Swift. At sixteen he went to London to study law, where he made his way among the greatest wits:—

The pupil of Swift and Pope, the friend of Lyttelton and Chatham, the darling of the Prince of Wales; beau, swordsman, wit, poet, courtier; the minion once of fortune, yet unspoil by her caresses, had long been known to Irishmen only as the saintly recluse of Longfield; and latterly an impoverished old man, fading away by the quiet euthanasia of a second childhood, with one sweet daughter—the only surviving child of twenty-two—clinging to him, and yet supporting him as ivy the mouldering wall.

From these social successes he was recalled to Ireland by what is termed a quaint interruption. A dying aunt made him guardian of her child of twelve years of age, whom he secretly married within two years. This gives Mr. Kingsley an opportunity of defending early marriages, and ourselves of noting that, as far as his history tells us, Brooke never through life denied himself in what he believed to be in the abstract virtuous inclinations. He spent his money with as little regard for the future as he married his wife. In Henry Brooke's case, says his panegyrist, it conduced to the growth of his noblest qualities; "growth in his lofty moral standard altogether heroic and godlike, in his delicate sensibility, in his chivalrous respect for woman, in his strong trust in mankind; in his pitiful yearning, as of a saving angel, over sin and sorrow; in his fresh and full manhood, most genial and yet most pure." But it seems to us that in all this Mr. Kingsley evades the question. Henry Brooke was at least of age. It is "the beautiful child wife," the mother of three children before she was eighteen, on whose case the argument turns. The marriage was a happy one, we are told, but we read of a failing life of langour and anxiety for her, and of a score of children dying before her own premature death. After eight years spent at the Irish Bar, Henry Brooke, then twenty-nine, came again to London, where he wrote a poem and a tragedy which made a sensation. His zeal for his patron the Prince of Wales, who caressed him with great familiarity, and presented him with many elegant and valuable tokens of friendship, led him into a strain of political declamation on patriotism, heroism, and death to tyrants, which awoke the jealousy of the Court. The performance of the play was prohibited, upon which he printed it, Dr. Johnson writing the preface; and the sale with other matters brought him a thousand pounds. But while his prospects were fairest a bad illness sent him to his native air for recovery; and his wife, afraid lest his zeal for the Prince should get him into trouble, and possibly, we imagine, little liking the company he would meet in his circle,

persuaded him to stay in Ireland, and give up London altogether.

Here Lord Chesterfield gave him a place of 400*l.* a-year, but his reforming spirit on the one hand, and an inability to keep money in his pocket on the other, were too much for the kindness of his friends. He was one of those men who must die poor. If he had prospered, Mr. Kingsley supposes he would have been a great literary personage, perhaps a great orator; "but in that case we should not have had the *Fool of Quality*." In his retirement from the world he was led to speculate on problems of political economy and the mistakes and abuses of social life, associating with them his own career and early successes. The plan of the story gives the impression of a mind immersed from childhood in ambitious day-dreams, and expatiating in imaginary successes and visions of gilt gingerbread splendour; his hero personating this inner self. Only such a habit of mind long indulged could have betrayed a writer even in old age into the delirium of extravagance in which the tale closes. When Mr. Kingsley calls the hero godlike, he really means this windy inflation in the author's mind. Wherever he reveals himself Harry shines out as a demi-god, and produces the effect of one on all beholders. We do not learn how far the *Fool of Quality* was ever popular. Mr. Kingsley is charmed with it perhaps because it bears out his own views of life and heroism. Wesley, who, after purging it of such passages as were not to his mind, published it for the use of the Methodists, pronounced it one of the most beautiful pictures that ever were drawn in the world; "the strokes are so delicately fine, the touches so easy, natural, and affecting, that I know not who can survey it with a tearless eye unless he has a heart of stone." But Wesley was a religious reformer, and reformers view all things in relation to their one absorbing object. We ask for readers who judge by the ordinary literary and critical standard. Tastes, we know, change in the course of a century; but would the pathos which John Wesley called irresistible, and which Mr. Kingsley considers too healthy and simple for tastes palied by French novels, ever have drawn tears unprompted? We are still able to relish the opening of the story. While the author treats of children, he writes like a man. There is a charming little fable, the "Three Silver Trout," quite a model of style. But when he comes to portray men and women, he writes like a child, and with as little power as a child over modern emotions. For ourselves, we are reminded of the old lady and the sea captain:—"Oh, captain, is there any fear?" "Plenty of fear, marm, but no danger." "Plenty of tears, we say; torrents of tears, flowing on all occasions; 'tears watering the ground'; but no pathos. Persons with the morbid sensibility attributed to Henry Brooke are not the people to touch the tender chord of stronger nerves. They simply embarrass us and shut up our sympathy. The stomach of our sense turns against those eager embraces, those mawkish creatures clasping each other to their hearts, catching eagerly round the neck, smothering with caresses, relating their gushes of tears and suffocating sobs, their unspeakable transports and unsupportable anguish. And if the men cry, the women must necessarily assert their keener sensibility by stronger measures; they faint, they scream, they swoon, they fall senseless with a loud shriek; and also—which is, we hold, a confirmation of our view—they fall in love with an aptitude and precocity which throws all the generosity and acceptance on the men's side. So wary is Harry's conscience on this head, that, on his first introduction at Court, where all eyes, including those of King William and Queen Mary, are upon him lost in absorbing wonder at his wit and grace, and where he dances with one of the maids of honour, he reproaches himself for paying her a compliment, as endangering the affections of an innocent girl; and this at so tender an age that the day after this scruple he is taken by his Mentor to see the lions in the Tower.

Another reason why we feel easy under the extreme miseries to which the author reduces his various heroes or heroines—for the book is made up of episodes—is that he himself so easily rallies from his own emotions. At their very worst extremities his people are never beyond being set on their legs again by a cup of tea or a bottle. When "the Man of Letters" dismal narration of calamities reaches its climax in his wife's act of justifiable homicide—a lady, in every sense a heroine, who, upon her husband presenting her on a previous occasion with a pint of sack and a Naples biscuit, suspecting they were not honestly come by, exclaims, "First perish your Arabella, perish also her infant, rather than on our account or on any account the least of the virtues of my Hammy should be lost"—having stuck the conventional seducer with her scissors, she snatches up her child and the money she had got together to liberate her husband from gaol, and hastens to inform him that she has left Lord Stivers weltering in his gore. A critical situation certainly, but not at all beyond the aid of the familiar consolations. The good man takes a coach, calls at a tavern on the way for a pint of Spanish wine to settle their spirits, and drives to lodgings in Cheapside, where he at once sends out the maid for the proper ingredients, and, by the time the kettle is on the fire and the tea and sugar are brought, he has got his wife into a frame of mind in which she can relate to him all that has passed during their separation. At the trial of Arabella for murder, which is one of the scenes of the book, a volunteer witness entertains judge and jury with a narrative of his own extraction, and relates what he had seen and heard through the keyhole, ejaculating, "Blessed heaven! to what surpassing sentiments was I then an amazed witness." Upon this valuable testimony Arabella is acquitted, gracefully curtseying herself out of court amid a storm of applause.

\* *The Fool of Quality*. By Henry Brooke, Esq. With a Biographical Sketch by the Rev. Charles Kingsley. New Edition. Macmillan & Co.

And, just as misery and disaster huddled in quick succession leave no trace, so it is with bloodshed. Blood flows from one end of the book to the other; and scarcely anybody is the worse. The sponge and hot water have to be called for as a matter of course before a recognition; and the whole *dramatis personæ* are losing and finding one another without intermission. People look at one another attentively, and out comes an old friend, an old lover, a father or a brother, who throw themselves into each other's arms, bathe each other in tears, and relate their history.

It is important, as showing the propensities of the author, to note that the title is a misnomer. He started with a design which something in him prevented his being able to carry out. The design was to draw a character so much nobler and purer than the world around, actuated by aims so far removed from selfishness, that he should pass among people incapable of understanding high principles of action for a fool. And Harry's mother, when his foster nurse introduces him first to her notice, takes him for a fool, and calls him one. After seeing the child of five put aside as of no use the glittering toys she has given him,

My lady piqued therat told the Earl that she resolved once more to prove the wits of the youngster; and whispering to Dickey, he immediately went out and took with him his companions. Soon after Dick returns without his shoes and with a pitiful face cries, "Brother Harry, I want a pair of shoes sadly; will you give me yours?" "Yes, I will," said Harry, "and instantly strips and presents them to him. Then entered another boy and demanded his stockings in the like petitioning manner; another begged his hat, another his coat, another his waistcoat—all of which he bestowed without hesitation; but when the last boy came in and petitioned for his shirt, "No, I won't," said Harry, a little moody. "I want a shirt myself." My lady then exclaimed, "Upon my honour, there is but the thickness of a bit of linen between this child and a downright fool." But my lord rose up, took Harry in his arms, and having tenderly embraced him—"God bless thee, my boy, and make thee an honour to old England."

This, we would observe, is about the only instance of self-denial attributed, or rather permitted, to our hero. Mr. Brooke's secret for setting the world to rights is a simple one—scattering money broadcast. During the rest of the story Harry goes about like a beneficent Providence, emptying a pocket which is filled again faster than he can empty it, and regarded by adoring crowds, not as a "fool," but an "angel" of quality. His Mentor, who kidnaps him that he may pursue his education free from parental interference, first whisks him away in a coach and six, with attendant servants, to give him a lesson in humility, then stuffs his pockets with crowns to give away to any and everybody, at the same time furnishing a closet with countless suits of apparel of all sizes, which he may distribute at his pleasure to the ragged objects he meets on the road; and next sends him with a tutor and 1,500*l.* to liberate debtors in the London gaols; assuring him that the more he spends the better he will be pleased, and that there is plenty more where that came from. And he is so far as good as his word that by the time he is seventeen Harry boasts to have spent 50,000*l.* of his Mentor's money. All this is a delightful exercise of imagination to one who has found the process of spending ill rewarded in real life; but we do not see the moral, nor how the hero by these means is raised into an ideal of what man might be. Mr. Kingsley expects "the average reader" to object to the morality as Quixotic. This objection is not ours, for the chivalrous knight suffers for his cause; whereas Harry always comes out gainer and victor. If an atheist throws a bottle at his head in return for the indignant lie he gives him, it "happily misses" him, and hurts the fleshy part of somebody's else's shoulder, leaving Harry at liberty to tell the blasphemer with one blow of his fist, and, as he lies insensible, to send off a drawer for a surgeon, saying, "I should be sorry that the wretch should die in his present state of reprobation." Don Quixote defending religion or virtue would be laid up in bed for a week. However, Mr. Kingsley is satisfied that such pictures fulfil the Gospel ideal, and prove Mr. Brooke a Realist, and as such a natural enemy of the Nominalists, among whom is classed Dr. Johnson, "his inferior in intellect," who, though he vindicated his tragedy, indulged in a private laugh at the author's expense.

A passion for display is fatal to this higher morality. Harry must do everything better than anybody else, get praised for it, and attract the eye of crowds high and low. Whether he relieves a beggar, rides a horse, dances at Court, or boxes with a rustic, there is always the same docile, admiring circle of spectators. As a lad he dines with the Premier. "We are quite alone," says the Earl to him on this occasion; "only two viscounts, a baronet, and four or five gentlemen," and he not only routs the whole party in argument, but they confess themselves routed. "I protest," says his lordship, "I never beheld this matter in the same light before." This passion arrives at last at a height of frenzy for which even Mr. Kingsley apologizes as a sign of failing powers. But old age does not alter the character; it only betrays what has always been there. We have already said that, while there are good and pious reflections interspersed all through, the first part contains the best writing. A dialogue between author and reader on the subject of ghosts, in which the former observes that an exceeding clear or an exceedingly callous conscience alike preserves from the natural fear of spirits, gives occasion for a touch of humour. Two travellers, we are told, the one pious, the other a profligate, met at an inn Hallowtide Eve. The conversation in the kitchen naturally fell upon spectres, and particularly on the man in gibbets who hung by the road, and was reported to descend between twelve and

one at night and take a turn about the old barn. "Do you believe any of this droll stuff?" said the profligate. "I know not what to think," said his pious companion:—

"As for my share," says the profligate, "I think I should not fear the great devil himself; and indeed I should be glad to have a little chat with the old gentleman." "Stout as you are," rejoined the other, "I will lay you a bet of five crowns that you dare not warm a poringer of broth and go and offer it without there to the man on the gibbet. I will depend on your honour for the performance of the articles." "Tis done," cried the other. The bets were produced and respectively deposited in the hands of the landlady.

Our pious traveller, who had begun to be alarmed for his wager, stole slyly out, while his companion was busied in heating the broth. He made up to the place where the deceased malefactor was taking the fresh air. The gallows was low, and by the advantage of a bank behind and his own agility, he leaped up and fastened his arms about the shoulders of the corpse, so that they both appeared but as one body. He had just fixed himself to his mind, when up comes his companion with the poringer and a stool. He directly mounted the stool, and reaching up a spoonful of broth to the mouth of the dead, with a firm and bold voice he cried, "Sup, man! why don't you sup?"

Scarce had these words been uttered when, fearful to hear, with a tone deep as hell and dismal as the grave, the man in gibbets replied, "It's too ho—t." "And, confound you, why don't you blow it then?" rejoined the other.

After reading this specimen our readers may be disposed to look into the *Fool of Quality* if it comes in their way; whether they will get through it is the question at issue between us and Henry Brooke's thoroughgoing eulogist.

#### SIR GEORGE POLLOCK.\*

THE character of Sir George Pollock as a brave and skilful officer had been established in India by his services in the Mahratta and Burmese wars. His reputation became greater after he had relieved Jellalabad, and occupied Cabul. At this time he had reached the mature age of fifty-six years. This was his first great service and his last. During the first Sikh war he was made a member of Council in Calcutta, and, but for the "rules of the service," his great experience and tried firmness might have been made available in the field, where we may venture to say that one more first-rate soldier would not have been superfluous. But as Lord Hardinge, the Governor-General, himself proceeded to the seat of war, it was perhaps necessary or desirable that Sir George Pollock should remain at Calcutta. He left India in 1846, having served upwards of forty years.

George Pollock was educated at the Military Academy at Woolwich, and, having obtained a commission in the Artillery on the Bengal establishment, he sailed for India in the latter end of 1803. He was actively employed next year in the war with Holkar. In the battle of Deig, which Lord Lake called "a very near business," the guns to which he was attached did good service against the superior artillery of the enemy. He was present at the taking of Deig, and at the bloody and fruitless assaults on Bhurtpore. His next active service was in the Nepaulese war of 1814-6, and in 1824 he found in the Burmese war a suitable opportunity for displaying his ability. He was in ill-health, and could not afford to go, as he had been medically advised, to Europe, and the happy thought struck him of applying to be sent to our army, which was already at Rangoon, and suffering much from sickness. Amid the absorbing duties of an artillery officer Pollock either got well, or had not time to be ill. The difficulties of the army in these campaigns lay not so much in fighting as in marching. From Rangoon almost to Ava Pollock carried his guns and himself in an efficient state.

The Burmese war gained high reputation for Pollock as an energetic and at the same time patient officer; but it affected his health so seriously that he was obliged to go on leave to Europe. His voyage home occupied nine months. He returned to India in 1830, and for the next eleven years his career was entirely uneventful. On New Year's day, 1842, while holding command of the Agra district, he received an order to proceed to Peshawur and take command of the troops preparing to relieve Jellalabad. The deplorable history of British disaster at Cabul has lately acquired fresh interest, not only as having given to Pollock the opportunity of glory, but also in reference to the question of frontier between Russian Asia and British India. The army which perished miserably at and near Cabul in the winter of 1841 was as unfortunate in its leaders as the army which marched triumphantly to Cabul the next year was fortunate. General Elphinstone who commanded at Cabul was enfeebled by disease, while Brigadier Shelton, who was next in rank, had the courage which inspires courage in others, but happened to disapprove of everything which his superior proposed. Shelton had lost an arm at the siege of St. Sebastian, where he served in the 9th Regiment, and this corps formed part of the army with which Pollock forced his way to Cabul and delivered the captives of the previous winter, among whom was Shelton. In spite of the disasters which he shared, and perhaps partly caused, he was an officer of whom his old regiment might well be proud. But let us return to Pollock, who found awaiting him at Peshawur a task which needed all his skill, patience, and resolution. Sale at Jellalabad was urgent for relief, but the troops at Pollock's disposal were unequal in numbers, and still more in health and spirits, for such

\* *The Life and Correspondence of Field Marshal Sir George Pollock, Bart., G.C.B., G.C.S.I. (Constable of the Tower).* By Charles Rathbone Low. London: Allen & Co. 1873.



an enterprise as the forcing of the Khyber Pass. Brigadier Wild had been beaten back from the mouth of this Pass, and the four native regiments of his command had now more than one thousand sick of an epidemic which, as Pollock guessed, was chiefly moral. He reported that the feeling among these regiments was "most lamentable"; it was encouraged by our so-called allies the Sikhs, and it rendered an advance hopeless until a stronger force of European troops could be collected to give confidence to the Sepoys.

With quiet firmness Pollock awaited the time proper in his own judgment for advancing, and, with that attention to details which he always showed, he made his arrangements so completely as to prevent the possibility of failure. The Commander-in-Chief, Sir Jasper Nicholls, in a report to the Horse Guards written some months afterwards, accurately described the difficulties of the position in which Pollock found himself. The Sepoys were declaring that they would not again advance through the Khyber Pass. The Sikhs were spreading alarm and encouraging and screening the desertion of the Sepoys, which was considerable:—

It was well that a cautious, cool officer of the Company's army should have to deal with them in such a temper, 363 miles from the frontier. General Pollock managed them exceedingly well, but he did not venture to enter the Pass till April, when reinforced by the 3rd Dragoons, a regiment of cavalry, a troop of horse-artillery, and other details. Lord Hill will at once perceive that the morale must have been low when horse-artillery and cavalry were required to induce the General to advance with confidence through this formidable Pass. Any precipitancy on the part of a general officer panting for fame might have had the worst effect.

Mr. Thomas Campbell Robertson, late member of the Supreme Council of India, writing in 1853 on the causes of the Indian Mutiny, says that a spirit of insubordination showed itself formidably before General Pollock's movement from Peshawur:—

Few know how much his country is indebted to that distinguished officer for the patience and skill with which he allayed the discontents and raised the morale of the native portion of his army before he advanced into the Khyber Pass.

There is of course no novelty in the plan on which General Pollock operated in forcing the Khyber Pass. All such defiles consist of two heights and a gorge, and it was long since perceived that the best method of attack is to crown the heights on either flank, and to have another column to attack below when the operations of the flanking parties appear to be developed. By this method Napoleon in 1799 carried the defile of Newmarckt; by it Soult forced the pass of Roncesvalles; and by it Pollock succeeded in penetrating the Khyber. A military writer who brings together these instances remarks that Pollock's arrangements were perfect in conception and complete in detail. The centre column was not meant to do any fighting, but was to remain halted in front of the Pass till the flanking columns had won their way to the rear of the barricades which the enemy had thrown up in the mouth of the defile, and it was then to advance through obstacles which the Sappers would have destroyed. A bugler was told off to each commanding officer of detachment, to sound whenever anything occurred to stay the advance of his particular party; and this call was taken up by every other bugler, and the whole of both flanking columns was to halt till the obstruction had been cleared, when the same bugler as before was to sound the advance. Thus the columns advanced simultaneously, and the advance of each being carefully regulated, there was no fear of their being overwhelmed in detail. The clearest orders were laid down as to the position of the baggage of each regiment, and an English officer was told off from each corps to see that the places assigned were kept. Such arrangements as these, says this writer, deserved the success they attained. It may be thought by some that the minute detail of the place of every camp-follower by the general was unnecessary. "Not so; there is no operation in war in which confusion is more likely to take place, none in which confusion is more fatal, than in the forcing of a narrow mountain pass." This writer remarks that the same precautions are necessary in retreating as in advancing through a pass; and it is a curious proof of this that General Pollock, who led the way in the return from Cabul, and invariably adhered to his formed plan, was never once attacked, while Generals Nott and McCaskill, who brought up the rear and neglected these precautions, were frequently harassed by the matchlock fire of the enemy. The march forward began on the 5th April, and Jellalabad was relieved on the 16th. About this time Lord Ellenborough succeeded Lord Auckland as Governor-General of India, and his correspondence with General Pollock has excited controversy and undergone adverse comment. He seems to have fluctuated between caution and boldness. He sent despatches which authorised Pollock to retire, but Pollock preferred to wait until he received not only authorisation but positive command. In the meanwhile Lord Ellenborough became aware that the public and the Home Government desired something to be done to re-establish our military character, and ultimately he contrived the ingenious plan of giving to General Nott the option of retiring from Candahar by way of Ghuznee and Cabul, while Pollock was to "endeavour to combine his movements" with those of General Nott in case he should decide on adopting the line of retirement by Ghuznee and Cabul. Thus Lord Ellenborough managed\* to give a discretion to the two generals to undertake what would be commonly described as an advance, while preserving a literal harmony with his previous despatches in which he had urged retreat. The honour of England thus became dependent on two generals, each of whom, happily, could trust the other and himself. It was not until the 20th August that

Pollock marched from Jellalabad towards Gundamuck. On the 13th September he forced the pass of Tezeen, after a hard day's fighting against Akhbar Khan, who became convinced by the result of it that further opposition was useless. A remarkable feature in all these operations is the great bodily activity of the European soldiers who took part in them. Wherever an Afghan could climb an Englishman followed him, and the bayonet was frequently used with good effect. The contrast is striking between the conduct of the three European regiments which advanced with Pollock and that of the regiment which retreated in the previous winter with Elphinstone. This difference was caused by circumstances and generalship. The action at Tezeen opened the road to Cabul, which was reached on the 15th September. Meanwhile Nott had taken Ghuznee, and was approaching Cabul from the other side. The excellent result of giving these generals their heads was promulgated to the Indian world by Lord Ellenborough in a triumphant proclamation. No two colleagues could have suited one another better than Pollock and Nott so long as they had to co-operate at a distance, but Nott's temper showed itself as soon as they came into close contact. However, Pollock was happily as calm as his brother general was irritable. Pollock's first care was the delivery of the prisoners who had remained in the hands of the Afghans since the disasters of the winter. In after years, when Pollock felt, as he sometimes did, disappointment at the limited opportunities and rewards of his military career, he was able to console himself with the recollection that he had saved his countrymen and countrywomen from the choice between a miserable death and a lifelong slavery among barbarians. The biographer dwells upon the fact that Pollock was only created a G.C.B., and not a peer, for his signal service. If Lord Auckland deserved to be made an earl for getting us into this Afghan scrape, certainly Pollock deserved to be made a baron for getting us out of it. But the reader will be rather struck with the caprice of fortune which ordained that Pollock's opportunity of distinction in command should be restricted to one year of an unusually long and vigorous life. In the Burmese war he was not even chief officer of artillery, but it is manifest that his superiors owed much to his vigour and ability. He gradually acquired a character which, when placed in a responsible position, he maintained. As an officer of the Company's army he was at a disadvantage compared with officers of the Queen's army, whose ability and resolution were not greater, while their knowledge of native troops was far less. Pollock would have been well employed in encouraging the Sepoys to make head against the Sikhs, but Gough and Hardinge undertook to withstand the Sikhs, and with great difficulty maintained our superiority in the field, while Pollock was quietly employed in an office at Calcutta. Thus, however, was this able soldier's life ordained. May British India find in the hour of need such men ready for arduous work as the Company's army produced in Nott and Pollock! The return march from Cabul was begun on October 12, and Peshawur was reached early in November. It is possible that Pollock's success would have been more highly appreciated if he had lost more men. The very completeness of his arrangements rendered them less impressive to the minds of ordinary readers of newspapers, who like to have what Wellington called a heavy butcher's bill. In forcing the Khyber Pass the casualties were only 135, and in the battle of Tezeen they were 162. These successes were gained on ground where artillery and cavalry could scarcely be employed at all. The infantry had to assail heights where every crag, precipice, and bypath was known to the defenders, who were armed with jezails, carrying death at distances at which Brown Bess was useless. This campaign, by its success and brilliancy disarms criticism, and military writers concur in speaking of it with warm commendation. Pollock lived long enough to enable his country to appreciate his services and to pay him late and by no means excessive honours. If ever Russian aggression should threaten India from Cabul, it is devoutly to be hoped that there may be a Pollock in command of our army at Peshawur.

#### NOTICE.

*We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.*

*The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.*

*The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.*

*Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.*

*Now ready, VOLUME XXXIV., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.*

*Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW Bill of Contents will be forwarded every Friday Evening by post, prepaid, to any Newsagent in Town or Country on application to the Publisher.*

